34TH CONGRESS, 1st Session. } SENATE. { REP. COM. No. 237.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

JULY 22, 1856.—Submitted and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BELL, of Tennessee, made the following

REPORT:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the memorial of Washington A. Bartlett, late a lieutenant in the navy of the United States, beg leave to submit the following report:

Mr. Bartlett complains that, by the action of the Executive, based upon the recommendation of the Board of Naval Officers, convened under the provisions of the law of the 28th February, 1855, entitled "An act to promote the efficiency of the navy," he was stricken from the rolls of the navy. He alleges that the action of the Board and the Executive was illegal and unjust, and prays that he be restored to his commission and original position in the navy. Your committee having already made a full and elaborate report, embodying their views of the scope and policy of the law of 28th February, 1855, and the manner in which it has been carried out, will not now repeat them, but will confine themselves to a simple recapitulation of the facts deposed to, or stated by, the witnesses who have either appeared before them personally, or whose statements have, at the request of the memorialist, been received as valid testimony.

In order to present the case free from all unnecessary embarrassment, it is admitted that so far as intelligence, physical capacity, temperate habits, a fair degree of professional acquirement and skill, and attention to duty are concerned, Mr. Bartlett was, at the time of his being stricken from the rolls of the navy, an efficient officer, and, if free from just imputations of moral delinquency, should have been retained on the active list.

Although in the first instance the investigations of the committee took a somewhat wider range, they have decided to confine themselves to three distinct charges:

1st. The illicit landing and sale at Monterey of a shawl.

2d. The landing free from duty and sale at San Francisco of a quantity of merchandise, on the pretence that it was intended for the use of the crew of the United States schooner Ewing, then under his command.

3d. Fraudulent and dishonest conduct in the discharge of duties voluntarily assumed as caterer of the ward-room mess of the United States ship Portsmouth.

As to the first charge, Purser James H. Watmough deposed that he "served on board the Portsmouth with Bartlett. Bartlett sold a shawl in Monterey to a lady on shore. Said shawl cost Bartlett seven dollars. The lady told him she gave ten dollars for it. He saw the shawl on the lady's shoulders, and at once identified it. Knew the shawl, because he had wanted to purchase it of Bartlett. Informed Lieutenant Missroon of the affair. Bartlett was compelled to take the shawl back. Thinks that Dr. Duval and himself made the lady a present of another shawl, that she might lose nothing by her transaction with Bartlett." On cross-examination witness stated that "the lady told witness she gave ten dollars for the shawl. Did not say that Bartlett's shawl was smuggled. The shawl was taken on shore by Dr. Duval and witness and presented to said lady; was taken on shore by permission of the collector. Bartlett was not present when the lady told him she had bought it of Bartlett. Bartlett here said that he had given the shawl to the lady, and that afterwards her husband had presented him with a horse worth about ten dollars."

Commander J. S. Missroon deposed: "That in the case of selling an article of dress to a lady in Monterey, Purser Watmough informed me of the facts substantially, as specified in my letter of October 16, 1846, adding that he had received the information from the lady in question. When questioned by me on the subject, Mr. Bartlett did not deny having sold the article to the lady, nor did he deny the price which it was said he had received for it. But he endeavored to excuse the sale by stating that he did not want it, that it required attention to preserve it, and that the lady desired to possess it. He did not deny having smuggled it to the shore, when I remarked that he was open to the charge of having smuggled the article under his uniform into a foreign country; nor did he reply to my comments upon the exorbitant advance he had received upon its cost, which I happened to be aware of. He appeared to be much affected by the detection, and expressed the hope that no further notice should be taken of the matter."

Your committee, had this matter stood alone, would not have considered it as sufficiently serious to compromit the character of Mr. Bartlett to a degree that would affect his efficiency, nor would they, even when connected with other charges, have given much weight to it, had he not, in taking the shawl back, recognized the impropriety of the transaction.

As to the second charge, Lieutenant Simms deposed: "That he served with Bartlett on Pacific coast. Left New York in United States schooner Ewing, as passed midshipman. Bartlett was executive officer of the Ewing when she left the United States. Was on board of the Ewing two years. The Ewing was commanded part of the time by Bartlett and part by Lieutenant McArthur. In conversation, the charge was that Bartlett had passed goods through the custom-house. Heard Bartlett say that the clothing he had was worth $750, taken on board the John G. Costar at Valparaiso, and landed at San Francisco. Bartlett said Harrison, custom-house officer, had passed them for the use of the vessel. Witness was attached to the vessel. The goods did not go on board, this was a matter of public notoriety on

shore. It was in the year 1849. Witness received a letter from Bartlett saying he had been accused of using schooner Ewing for smuggling purposes. Witness afterwards met him and said he knew nothing personally about it. Bartlett said he had seen Harrison and had told him the goods were for the use of the vessel, and Harrison had charged nothing for passing them."

A. C. Rhind, who was a passed midshipman and acting executive officer of the Ewing, introduced as a witness by Bartlett, deposed:

"On one occasion, I had been on shore in San Francisco on duty. On my return on board, I missed one of the boats and crew. I inquired of the officer of the deck where the boat was, and understood that she had been sent by Mr. Bartlett on board of another vessel to assist in breaking out some articles. The boat returned shortly after, and, as I understood, without having accomplished the desired object, either from the absence of the captain or the person who was to attend to the delivery of the goods. I objected to the boats being sent on such duty, because I did not consider it as appertaining exclusively to the service of the vessel. Whether I stated my objections particularly to Mr. Bartlett, I do not recollect, but they were expressed to the officers generally, and, I think, to Mr. Bartlett personally. The boat was never, to my knowledge, sent back, nor did the crew ever perform any such service, so far as I know. My position there was such that I never would have permitted any such infractions of the requirements of the service, and none such ever occurred. This had almost entirely escaped my recollection, but was recently recalled to my mind by a conversation had (I think, in February last) with Lieutenant C. Simms, one of the officers of the vessel. The name of the vessel to which the boat was sent was John G. Costar, last from Valparaiso, I think."

James W. Bingham, a witness introduced by Mr. Bartlett, deposed that "he was a member of the firm of Bingham, Reynolds, Bartlett & Co., of San Francisco. That said firm received from ship John G. Costar an invoice of clothing, shipped from Valparaiso, which was sold for account of Bartlett, and proceeds paid him. Remembers the fact of receiving and making sale of the goods. That said goods were regularly entered and cleared at custom-house in San Francisco, and were received from said ship John G. Costar by custom-house permit, as required by law. He was Bartlett's partner; for nearly three years associated with him in business in San Francisco. On cross-examination, he said the goods were boots, shoes, and sailors' clothing. They were imported from Valparaiso on Mr. Bartlett's individual account. We sold them and passed the amount to his credit, charging him commissions as we would any stranger. We had nothing to do with the goods but to receive them. This was the only instance I ever knew when Bartlett imported goods on his own account. The value of the goods was between seven and eight hundred dollars. The duties on them were not paid, according to the best of my recollection. They were entered as being intended for the United States seamen, and therefore free."

Mr. Bartlett, at page 23 of his printed statement addressed to this committee, states: "While at Valparaiso I purchased from the United States naval agency $728 25 worth of British sample clothing, (sea-

men's, and especially suited for surveying service,) equal to only one suit per man. My object in doing so was to have the means within my own control of supplying the crew with clothing suitable to their work at a low price. We had learned that clothing had, with every thing else, reached almost fabulous prices at San Francisco. These goods were shipped on board of the John G. Costar, and not on board of the Ewing. When they arrived at San Francisco, they were regularly passed through the custom-house, as will appear by the following affidavits." Then follow the affidavits of James W. Bingham, and of E. H. Harrison, who was then the collector of San Francisco:

The undersigned, James W. Bingham, of the city of New York, being duly sworn, deposeth and saith, that he was a member of the firm of Bingham, Reynolds, Bartlett & Co., of San Francisco, and resident there from August, 1849, until October, 1851. That said firm received from ship John G. Costar an invoice of clothing, shipped from Valparaiso, which was sold for account of W. A. Bartlett, and proceeds paid him. Deponent has not now before him the books of said firm, which are in San Francisco, but can be produced or referred to within sixty days, if required for verification of deponent's statesales of goods before mentioned. The said goods were regularly ment. That deponent remembers the fact of receiving and making entered and cleared at custom-house in San Francisco, as deponent firmly believes, and were received from said ship John G. Costar by custom-house permit, as required by law.

JAS. W. BINGHAM.

STATE OF NEW YORK, }
City and County of New York, } *ss.*

On this 17th day of April, one thousand eight hundred and fifty-six, before me a notary public, duly commissioned and sworn, personally appeared James W. Bingham, and to me known to be the subscriber to the foregoing statment, and made oath that the same is true and correct, to the best of his information and belief.

[L. S.] Witness my hand and official seal, the day and year above written.

JOHN DRAKE.

PHILADELPHIA, *April* 7, 1856.

The undersigned, formerly the United States collector in and for the port and district of San Francisco, Territory of California, and so acting in the year A. D. 1849, and to the month of October 1849, when relieved by Col. J. Collier, esq., his legal successor, hereby states, for the benefit of W. A. Bartlett, esq., late of the navy, and for any use the said Bartlett may desire to make of this paper, that it was the practice of the custom-house at San Francisco, at the period referred to, viz: 1849, to demand of the master of every merchant vessel entering the port of San Francisco a full and complete sworn manifest

of the entire cargo, whether taken on board at the commencement of the voyage, or at any port on the route, and that immediately the vessel entered the port, (and even before said manifest was due at the custom-house,) and before her hatches could be opened and any article could be landed, a sworn "visitor" and "inspector" was placed on board, and the hatches were locked or secured by custom-house seals, and that when the hatches were opened they were so opened under the charge of said sworn inspector, and that no article or package of the cargo could be landed from the ship until a regular "permit" was handed to the inspector, signed by the collector or one of his deputies, or the permit clerk, under the usual forms and guards of the office.

And the undersigned further says, that such permit, which was the only legal proof to the inspector that he had authority to land packages, would, on his receipt of it and consequent delivery of the packages enumerated upon it revert to the custom-house, as the inspector's voucher of delivery; and would there remain with and share the fate of the archives of the custom-house.

And the undersigned further says, that while he cannot recall, from personal recollection, the circumstances of the importation of clothing, which Mr. Bartlett admits he imported into San Francisco, from Valparaiso, in 1849, in the ship John G. Costar, the undersigned does not doubt that on the receipt of an application, whether verbal or in writing, to permit the articles referred to to be landed, whether they were to be entered for duty or free, or whether the question of duties remained to be decided, that either the undersigned or his deputy did give, either to Mr. Bartlett or some authorized agent of his, a full permit to enter the clothing, or else such agent could not have gotten possession of them, either from the master of the ship or the inspector of customs. And the undersigned has no reason to suppose that Mr. Bartlett, the master of the John G. Costar, or the inspector of customs, or either of them, combined to evade the laws of the customs, in a matter of such trifling importance or in any other case; and which, in this case, must have involved the ship and cargo, in which, it is not supposed, that Mr. Barlett had any interest.

The undersigned does not see in this transaction alluded to anything to implicate Mr. Bartlett, or to attach to him a charge of smuggling. It is evident that he applied to the proper authority to have the articles landed and placed under his control. And the question of duties or no duties was, under the circumstances of the customs in California, a question the undersigned could fully decide for himself and *the public service;* and that the undersigned did decide the matter in such manner as the circumstances called for there can be no doubt.

And the undersigned further says, that at no period during the time of his administration of the customs at San Francisco was any charge ever laid, or attempted to be laid, before him, of any attempt, intention, or act of smuggling, on the part of Lieut. Bartlett, then commanding the United States Schooner "Ewing," or subsequently to his being relieved of that command.

And the undersigned declares that Lieut. Bartlett enjoyed a high

reputation in San Francisco for honor, probity, and attention to his duties, in all his official and private relations, and that among his acquaintances, and they were extensive in that population, this officer stood high in their esteem and respect. And the undersigned knows of nothing which should discredit Lieut. Bartlett as a public officer and gentleman.

E. H. HARRISON.

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, }
City of Philadelphia, } *ss.*

Be it known that, on the day of the date hereof, before me, Edward Wilcox, notary public for the commonwealth of Pennsylvania, by lawful authority duly commissioned and sworn, residing in Philadelphia, personally appeared the before named E. H. Harrison, and acknowledged the foregoing instrument of writing to be his act and deed.

[L. S.] In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal, the 7th day of April, A. D. 1856.

EDMUND WILCOX, *Notary Public.*

Under the third charge, that of dishonesty in the administration of a fund confided to Lieutenant Bartlett by his messmates on board the Portsmouth, the following correspondence and testimony was produced to the committee:

UNITED STATES SHIP PORTSMOUTH, *October* 8, 1846.

When you ceased to be caterer of this mess at Monterey, and rendered an account of your office, we became convinced that you had not only betrayed the trust reposed in you by your messmates, by the most culpable negligence, but likewise in a manner far more serious, to which we only now allude. For this and for a number of other acts of yours, while on board this ship, we have long ceased to have for you the feelings of an equal, and have wished no longer to know you, and now that you have left the ship and ceased to be a member of our mess, we take this manner of intimating to you that we wish hereafter to meet you as a stranger.

J. S. MISSROON,
JAMES H. WATMOUGH,
BENJAMIN F. B. HUNTER,
A. A. HENDERSON, *Assistant Surgeon.*
M. DUVALL,
N. B. HARRISON, *Acting Master.*

W. A. BARTLETT, *Lieutenant.*

OFFICE IN YERBA BUENA, *October* 15, 1846.

SIR: I am under the necessity of addressing you concerning a note which I have received, signed by Lieutenant Missroon and five other officers of the ward-room mess of the ship, charging me with "cul-

pable negligence in managing the affairs of the mess," "and, also, betraying the trust reposed in me in a far more serious manner," "and that for this and a number of other acts while on board the ship they desire hereafter to consider me a stranger."

Charges like the above, sir, cannot be by me received without meeting them, let the consequence be what it may. I meet them with the most positive denial of any foundation in fact, and demand that they be proved or withdrawn.

I place myself on the ground of my entire innocence of any such intent or act, as implied in the charge, and upon that ground I will stand or fall. What the "other acts" referred to are I know not; but I feel confident in asserting that any "act" of mine, either public or private, can be explained to any unprejudiced mind in such a manner as to acquit me from any serious offence against the laws of the navy, or propriety of conduct required of me as an officer and gentleman.

I submit to you, sir, the case, and desire that you call upon them to show why they have taken this course, when there are methods of proceeding so different, and which would give me a fair chance of confronting them, which cannot be expected without others to decide between us.

I shall await patiently the time when I can meet these charges on fair terms, either before yourself or any court of inquiry or court martial, which may be required to bring out the truth, and this matter to a final issue; that issue I have no desire to avoid, and the only reason that I did not lay it before you the moment I received the note was because the exigencies of the service, as you are well aware, required that there should be no interruption to the preparations for the hurried departure of the forces. Relying on the ground of my entire innocence, and the power of truth, I await the result with all possible calmness, and the continued desire to merit your approbation in the discharge of all my duties.

Very respectfully, sir, I have the honor to be your obedient servant,

WASHINGTON A. BARTLETT,
Lieutenant United States Navy.

Commander J. B. MONTGOMERY, *U. S. N.*,
Commmanding Northern District of California.

UNITED STATES SHIP PORTSMOUTH,
Yerba Buena, October 16, 1846.

SIR: Mr. Bartlett in his letter to you of yesterday, apprising you of the determination which the ward-room mess has arrived at in his case, has been pleased to place me in a conspicuous position, by the sole mention of my name; this, and his tone of defiance, make me feel myself called upon to meet a certain part of that letter in a manner more direct than otherwise I should have been disposed to do.

Mr. Bartlett says, "I feel confident in asserting that 'any act' of mine, either public or private, can be explained to any unprejudiced mind in such a manner as to acquit me from any serious offence

against the laws of the navy, or propriety of conduct required of me as an officer and gentleman," and "I shall await patiently the time when I can meet these charges on fair terms, either before yourself or any court of inquiry or court martial, which may be required to bring out the truth," &c.

In the first place, sir, I desire it to be understood that, as the executive officer of this ship, I have more than once seriously thought of preferring charges against Lieutenant Bartlett; but have, in each instance, been deterred *solely* by the entire prostration of the man when spoken to by me officially of his acts, which were at variance with the usages of the service, and with the deportment of an officer and gentleman. This feeling of compassion is now, however, removed by the assurances which he gives you of the uniform propriety of his conduct, challenging investigation.

I beg leave therefore to inform you, sir, of my immediate readiness to submit charges against Lieutenant Bartlett, for unofficer-like conduct, in bringing to sea a stock of clothing, cloths, cigars, &c., which were vended to his brother officers and others; making his state-room a kind of huckster's shop, and degrading thereby the respectability of the ward-room. In speculating upon a private library and meanly soliciting subscriptions of money from individuals, some of whom, it was well known, would not continue in the ship longer than her outward passage, and among whom was a public functionary. In disposing of, at *private* and *secret* sale to a lady at Monterey, an article of dress, at an exorbitant advance upon its cost; and when detected and exposed in it, withdrawing the article, thus showing his consciousness of the impropriety; all of which, whenever required, shall appear in specific form. My information on the foregoing points was mainly derived from the ward-room officers, enough of whom are now in the squadron to substantiate the charges.

If it be deemed proper to go further back than this cruise, or should Mr. Bartlett desire to do so, in order to establish the point of "that propriety of conduct required of me as an officer and gentleman," there will be no difficulty in adducing instances upon the testimony of respectable officers, (I name Passed Midshipmen Morris and Duer,) which occurred in the surveying service, and which places Mr. Bartlett in a worse light than anything charged against him in this letter, a statement of which you are at liberty to call on me for.

Lieutenant W. Shenck, who is expected here in February, is an important witness, now that Lieutenant Forest has returned to the United States. With a desire to act openly in the matter, I would respectfully request that Mr. Bartlett may be made aware of all I communicate to you on this subject, and I beg leave to suggest that, if you determine to recommend a court, or if Mr. Bartlett still desires to have one, it be assembled before the witnesses now in the squadron return to the United States, among whom are Dr. Chase, Mr. Carter, and Mr. Shenck.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

J. S. MISSROON,
First Lieut. U. S. Ship Portsmouth.

To Commander J. B. MONTGOMERY, *U. S. Ship Portsmouth.*

UNITED STATES SHIP PORTSMOUTH,
Yerba Buena, October 16, 1846.

SIR: We have perused the letter of Lieutenant Bartlett handed by you to the executive officer last evening, which complains of the grounds upon which we have thought it necessary and proper to desire him to discontinue his acquaintance with us in future.

In addressing you this letter we beg leave to assure you, sir, that we do not feel ourselves bound to answer any demand coming from Lieutenant Bartlett; we write only for your information.

The palpable maladministration of our mess affairs induced the mess to deprive him of the office of caterer. Suspicions of his dishonesty in the disposal of funds entrusted to him were strengthened by his delay and evident reluctance in yielding up the mess accounts to his successor; but these mere suspicions became confirmed when, in course of examination, it appeared that he had charged more than was proved to have been the actual daily expenses, in several instances, and which, when so proved, he in subsequent accounts altered the items to suit the evidence adduced against his previous statement. The balancing of his accounts was made by a convenient and repeated insertion of "sundries" of which he could give no satisfactory information.

At this period it was contemplated to signify to Mr. Bartlett, that he could no longer be associated with as a messmate, but his pitiably depressed deportment, and meek submission to the cool reserve with which he was generally treated, moved our compassion, while it convinced us of his conscious guilt. When, however, he considered himself as withdrawn from the mess by his engagements on shore, we were unwilling to be longer recognized by him as acquaintances, and therefore it was that we addressed him our note.

"Other acts" to which we had reference, and of which Mr. Bartlett most strangely professes himself to be ignorant, scarcely require recapitulation here; those committed previous to, as well as during the present cruise, have certainly given him a most unenviable reputation and notoriety in the navy, so much so, indeed, that no less than two officers of standing, now in this squadron, have objected to orders to this ship, because they would necessarily by them be associated with Mr. Bartlett, alleging his character as the ground of objection. But, sir, in order to avoid a charge of vague generalities in a matter so serious, we will cite an instance of disreputable conduct of comparatively recent occurrence, which has had great weight with us in the course we have taken.

At Monterey, in May last, he disgraced himself as an officer, and reflected discredit upon his ship, by smuggling and disposing of an article of dress to a lady, at an exorbitant advance upon its cost, evincing at the same time his own sense of the impropriety of the transaction by asking a promise of secrecy, and by subsequent shameful equivocation when questioned on the subject.

We are surprised at his assumed defiance and reckless denial of facts which are so susceptible of the fullest proof, and in order that

Mr. Bartlett may comprehend his position, we respectfully request that he may see this letter.

We have the honor to be your obedient servants,

J. S. MISSROON, *Lieutenant*,
BEN. T. B. HUNTER, *Acting Lieutenant*,
JAMES H. WATMOUGH,
A. A. HENDERSON, *Ass't Surgeon*,
N. B. HARRISON, *Acting Master*.

ALCALDE'S OFFICE, YERBA BUENA,
November 14, 1846.

SIR: Enclosed you will receive the letters to which you referred in your letter to me of this date. I trust that, through a kind Providence, the time will come when the poison shall be extracted from them, and my mind relieved from the load with which they have oppressed me. As, sir, you did not ask me to make any explanations upon them, I shall not offer any, except to say that my anxious efforts to serve my messmates faithfully, and in all things to the best of my ability, have been most sorely requited; while acts of kindness and repeated solicitation to part with some articles I could spare (although always unwilling) have been represented in a light far different from that in which they were received, when it was considered that a favor had been conferred; and others are stated or rumored that have no foundation in fact. Upon such charges it seems useless to attempt by explanation to disabuse the minds of those who state that they have so deliberately concluded; therefore I cannot hope that aught I could say would make any favorable impression upon them; hence I only say or write thus much, and to you, sir, only.

Trusting that to my esteemed commander, who has so long known me, I shall be yet able to make good my defence and prove ever worthy of his confidence,

I have the honor to be, with high respect, your obedient servant,

WASH'N A. BARTLETT.

Commander J. B. MONTGOMERY,
United States Ship Portsmouth.

Commander J. S. Missroon deposed that "Mr. Bartlett was placed in Coventry for transactions believed to be dishonest, and which he failed to explain satisfactorily when aware of those doubts by his messmates of his honesty."

Purser James H. Watmough deposed that "it was the opinion of the mess that they had been defrauded by Bartlett. Bartlett stated he had given the steward such an amount; the steward denied it."

Dr. A. A. Henderson deposed that "he had a decided conviction at the time the letter of October 8, 1846, to which his name is signed,

was written, that Bartlett was dishonest. When Bartlett submitted his accounts as caterer of the mess of the Portsmouth, there was a want of a proper series of vouchers.

"From the action of the mess it must have been evident to Bartlett that his messmates entertained doubts of his honesty in disbursing the mess funds. Instead of meeting this in a manly and straightforward spirit, he seemed to be depressed, and to endeavor to shrink from an investigation. In the vouchers submitted by him, certain daily expenditures were charged for marketing, which the ward-room steward asserted were incorrect and too large. This, upon being pointed out to Bartlett, was altered by him to suit the assertions of the steward, by changing and deducting amounts in certain items, and adding to others, although the aggregate amount remained unchanged."

"Witness associated freely with officers of the navy on Pacific coast, and had opportunities of learning Bartlett's standing among his peers. It was bad. He was often spoken of contemptuously, and was regarded as deficient in the spirit of a gentleman. It was the conviction of witness that Bartlett declined urging his own trial, fearing to meet the result."

Dr. Marius Duval deposed that, "about the time witness joined the vessel, Bartlett told him that his mess account would be for initiation $43, and regular account $30, all of which witness paid him. On the arrival of the vessel at Monterey, the purser informed witness that Bartlett had drawn $30 on witness' account, for mess, &c. In less than two months the mess were surprised to find that there were no mess stores. Bartlett was broken, and another caterer chosen.

"The mess asked Bartlett for a statement of his account, but he could not render a satisfactory one. However, he did make a statement, which contained inconsistencies that were pointed out to him. He thereupon altered it in various particulars, but only made it more confused. Witness thought this a perfectly dishonest transaction on the part of Bartlett. Bartlett attempted to make explanations, but they were unsatisfactory. The mess charged him with dishonesty. He looked like a culprit, and could hardly hold up his head. Indeed, his condition was so abject, that it excited a good deal of commisseration in some of the mess. Perhaps the mess would have arrived at a different conclusion, had not Bartlett been a ready penman and good at figures, and particularly careful in matters where his own money was directly concerned. After these transactions Bartlett went on shore and attempted to create the impression that he was popular with the mess.

"Witness associated freely with officers of the navy while he was on Pacific coast. Before witness knew Bartlett he had heard of him, and he was always spoken of contemptuously. As a general thing he was looked upon in the squadron as a very dishonest and dishonorable person."

"The mess of the Portsmouth consisted of nine members. At the time the letter October 8, 1846, was written, some of the mess were engaged on shore duty. All of the mess on board at the time signed said letter."

By the testimony of Commander Missroon, it appears that Bartlett was separated from the active list by a vote of fourteen to one. He was dropped by thirteen votes, one given for leave of absence and one for furlough.

The minutes of the evidence taken before the committee, and all other papers connected with the examination of the case, are herewith submitted, in order that if the Senate should deem it expedient they may be printed with the report.

SENATE NAVAL COMMITTEE ROOM,
March 8, 1856.

Present: Mr. Mallory, Chairman, Mr. Fish, Mr. Slidell, Mr. Bell.

The committee took under consideration the case of Wash. A. Bartlett, late a lieutenant in the United States navy, and whose petition to be restored to his former position in the navy is now pending before this committee.

Mr. Bartlett being present,

Lieutenant Charles C. Simms, United States navy, appeared and was sworn by the Chairman.

Mr. Bartlett inquired of the Chairman if he could be allowed to have counsel and introduce witnesses.

The Chairman replied that it was unusual to have counsel before committees.

Mr. Bell said that Mr. Bartlett was not on trial. The committee took this action merely to satisfy themselves. Could not examine witnesses and hear counsel. Could not go into a technical and critical examination as could a court martial.

Mr. Slidell said it was a physical impossibility. Impossible to allow counsel. It would take too long. Committee would only go into an examination of Mr. Bartlett's expenditures in France and his conduct during his cruise in the Pacific. Also, would examine into a letter published some weeks since in New York Herald, purporting to be the result of a conversation between Commodore Perry and Mr. Bartlett, and attributed to Mr. Bartlett.

Mr. Chairman said the committee would furnish the identical facts on which the Board acted in this case, and will report on facts which may or may not have been before said Naval Board.

Lieutenant Simms, being examined, deposed as follows:

He is a lieutenant in the United States navy. Served with Bartlett on the Pacific coast. Left New York in United States schooner Ewing as passed midshipman. Did not sail as acting master. Bartlett was executive officer of the Ewing when she left United States. Mr. Rhind afterwards became the executive officer. Was on board the Ewing two years. The Ewing was commanded, part of the time, by Bartlett, and part by Lieutenant McArthur. Knows that Bartlett had some pictures and two watches when he sailed. Don't know how they were disposed of. Is satisfied they were not landed in the vessel's boats. In

In conversation the charge was that Bartlett had passed goods through the custom-house. He heard Bartlett say the clothing he had was worth $750; taken on board the John G. Coster at Valparaiso and landed at San Francisco. Bartlett said Harrison (custom-house officer) passed them for the use of the vessel. Witness was attached to the vessel. The goods did not go on board. This was a matter of public notoriety on shore. It was in the year 1849.

Witness received a letter from Bartlett saying he (B.) had been accused of using schooner Ewing for smuggling purposes. Witness afterwards met him and said he knew nothing personally about it. Bartlett said he had seen Harrison, and had told him the goods were for the use of the vessel, and Harrison had charged nothing for passing them.

Bingham, Reynolds, Bartlett & Co., were a public firm in San Francisco. I think said firm had cards out, signs, &c. Bartlett was in the navy at this time, apparently attached to schooner Ewing, but held no position on board. Was executive officer, but did not perform the duties nominally attached. Bartlett appeared to give his personal attention to the store, and was active therein. Never saw him sell goods, but can bring evidence that he did. Was in the store, saw bales of goods, &c. Appeared to be doing a good business. It was a whosesale and retail store, to the best of his belief. Store was well stocked. It was witness' impression that the United States seamen and boats had been used for the purpose of carrying Bartlett's goods on shore. Has since understood from Lieutenant Rhind that he protested against it, and it was not done. Bartlett, while attached to the Ewing, during her absence to the Sandwich Islands for several months, performed no duty. Witness, on 12th March, 1850, reported Bartlett for not attending to duty and for keeping on shore. Said report was, however, withdrawn, and Bartlett ordered on watch.

(Here witness introduced his said report, which is hereto annexed, marked A, which was read and made a part of witness' deposition.)

Bartlett objected to the reading of this letter, saying it was the first time he had ever heard of it. Said he never was the proper executive officer of the Ewing. Was commander, was relieved. Was to be attached to the Edith, which was lost.

Witness stated that statements contained in said letter were correct.

Mr. Chairman. What was Bartlett's general standing and reputation among his peers?

Answer. So far as witness knows, he never had an enviable reputation. Not such a one as he should like to have had himself. Witness was out on Pacific coast nearly four years. Nearly two years on board Ewing. Associated freely with naval officers while in the Pacific. Knows of no other transactions of trade by Bartlett than those alluded to. This evidence given by him is of his own knowledge. Knows nothing to exonerate Bartlett from these charges. Was on board the Massachusetts after he left the Ewing, and came home in the Lexington store-ship.

Mr. Slidell here remarked that he considered the general standing of a man among his peers a fair method of investigation in revising the action of such a Board as was the Navy Board, &c.

In reply to a question by Mr. Fish, witness said Bartlett was connected with the Ewing about a month after her arrival on the Pacific. Bartlett said he went on board as a volunteer.

Witness resumed: Was attached to vessel when Bartlett went on board to go to Oregon. Bartlett was on board several months. Came from Oregon to California in September. On return of vessel, witness left her, I can't say whether Bartlett remained on board any longer.

Cross-examined by Bartlett:

Question. Don't you know that McArthur never intended to go out in the Ewing, &c.

Answer. No. Heard, after arrival in California, that there were to be two vessels on that service (surveying?) Was not aware that Bartlett was to be relieved from duty by McArthur. So far as surveying was concerned, Bartlett was actively engaged, but not as to duties of ship. Lieutenant McArthur left at Astoria to go to Puget Sound. Bartlett commanded as senior officer.

In reply to question by Mr. Chairman: His knowledge of the sale of the pictures was derived from Bartlett himself. The pictures were carried out in the Ewing. There were two or three of them. Can't say they were carried out for the embellishment of the ship. Don't know what they were sold for.

(Bartlett said they were engravings: Battle of Chepultepec and Senate Chamber.)

It was a matter of notoriety on shore and on board that Bartlett, while executive officer of the Ewing, was publicly engaged in mercantile business.

Never saw Bartlett till he met him in the Ewing.

Knows nothing further, &c.

Purser James H. Watmough, United States navy, was now sworn and examined, and deposed as follows:

He sailed from Norfolk in 1845 in the Portsmouth sloop-of-war. The first thing he heard commented upon was the fact of Mr. Bartlett having brought on board a parcel of books for the use of the vessel, and that he had collected $90 from the officers therefor. Thinks the books were Harper's circulating library. Witness was purser. This act of Bartlett's, in bringing books on board, was commented upon as being officious. Don't think there were $90 worth of books, but don't know.

There was a Mr. Smith on board as a passenger, in character of a public functionary. Bartlett sold him (Smith) twelve shirts, at $1 each. Thinks he saw the bill, but is not certain. This was a matter of notoriety on board ship. The mess laughed at it. Bartlett sold a shawl in Monterey to a lady on shore. Said shawl cost Bartlett $7; the lady told witness she gave $10 for it. Witness saw the shawl on the lady's shoulders, and at once identified it. Never said anything to Bartlett about it. Knew the shawl, because he had wanted to purchase it of Bartlett. Informed Lieutenant Missroon of the affair. Bartlett was compelled to take the shawl back. Thinks that Dr. Duval and himself made the lady a present of another shawll that she might lose nothing by her transaction with Bartlett.

(Here the letters marked B were introduced by Mr. Chairman and read.)

Mr. Bartlett said he had himself made the letter of Lieutenant Missroon, et. al., to Captain Montgomery an official paper.

Mr. Slidell.—*Question.* Was application made to the *crew* of the Portsmouth to subscribe to the library, and was it stopped by the officers.

Answer. Was under the impression that it was intended to be made, and that an order was given to stop it.

In answer to another question by Mr. Slidell, witness answered: It was the opinion of the mess that they had been defrauded by Bartlett.

In reply to a question by Mr. Fish, witness replied: Bartlett stated he had given the steward such an amount; the steward denied it. Witness did not himself examine the accounts. Dr. Henderson was one of the gentlemen who examined the accounts.

Cross-examined by Mr. Bartlett:

Don't recollect that Mr. Watson was caterer. The lady told witness she gave Bartlett ten dollars for the shawl. Did not say Bartlett's shawl was smuggled. The shawl taken on shore by Dr. Duval and witness, and presented to said lady, was taken on shore by permission of the collector. Thinks that some of the officers of the Massachusetts had articles for sale. Saw things for sale on board the Constitution. Remembers the shawl, because he wanted to buy it himself. Bartlett was not present when lady told him she had bought it of him, (B.) (Bartlett here said he had given the shawl to the lady, and that, afterwards, her husband presented him with a horse, worth about ten dollars.)

Witness bought a quarter cask Madeira from Purser Taylor, on board the Constitution, who brought it home for him, &c.

Don't remember that the library was taken on board the Portsmouth by consent of officers. Don't think there were one hundred volumes. Remembers Smith was sick at Valparaiso, &c.

(Here Mr. Bartlett submitted papers marked, respectively, C, D, and E.)

C purports to be a list of articles for mess, &c., in the handwriting of witness, as admitted by him.

D purports to be mess account of Mr. Bartlett.

E is the bill containing catalogue of books, sold by the Messrs. Harpers, and by him said to have been placed in the Portsmouth.

Witness, in reply to a question by Mr. Bartlett, said: He had known officers to give up articles of clothing to other officers, &c., but never knew them to sell them.

Mr. Bartlett said Lieutenant Watson, of marine corps, was caterer.

Witness said Mr. Watson was not asked to sign the letter written by Lieutenant Missroon, himself, et. al., to Bartlett.—(See B, for letter alluded to.)

Don't recollect how long after the settlement of the mess affairs at Monterey before letter of October 8 was written. Was not in the

ship when said letter was written: signed it on his return thereto. Caterer of a mess has full discretion, &c.

In answer to Mr. Chairman. Was in the Pacific between three and three and a half years. Associated freely with officers of the navy. Bartlett was unpopular. Do not think he had any standing as an officer or as a man. Do not think he had a friend. Thinks none of the crew paid anything towards Bartlett's library, only officers. Do not know that Bartlett withdrew the subscription list. Do not know positively about an order being given to stop the list.

Cross-examined by Mr. Bartlett:

Do not recollect whether the officers of the Constitution sold anything to officers of the Portsmouth. Do not recollect about Lieutenant Missroon buying things, &c.; thinks it probable. Do not know that Commodore Biddle disposed of articles brought by him from China and Japan, &c.

Question by Bartlett. Did you ever know any testimony that would stand the test of a court martial?

Answer. Cannot say how far the steward's testimony would go.

Knows nothing further, &c.

Lieutenant Pendleton G. Watmough, United States navy, was now sworn and examined, and deposed as follows, viz:

Was on board the Portsmouth about five months as midshipman. Knows nothing relative to charges against Bartlett relative to mess account, &c. As a general thing, the officers and sailors had no confidence in Bartlett; witness had not. Bartlett was not considered to have any high or respectable standing among his peers as a gentleman or an officer. * * * It is not unusual to have libraries, and for sailors to subscribe, &c. * * * Was in the Pacific three years. Saw how Bartlett was treated by his messmates with contempt, degrading to have to submit to, in manner, voice, and gesture. Associated freely with the officers in the navy during his stay in the Pacific.

Cross-examined by Mr. Bartlett:

Left Norfolk in the Portsmouth in 1845. Went to Rio, then to Valparaiso. Knows nothing of Bartlett's mess accounts, because he (witness) was in the steerage. Thinks he subscribed to Bartlett's library, but do not recollect. Has no recollection of giving his consent to said library. Has subscribed to libraries on board ship, and known the men to do so also. Bartlett bore the reputation generally of being fond of exaggerating, of the marvellous, general looseness of moral principle, want of veracity. He had some merit as a mathematician, surveyor, and navigator.

Knows nothing further, &c.

Committee adjourned, to meet at 10 o'clock, Tuesday, proxima.

TUESDAY, March 11, 1856.

The committee met pursuant to adjournment.

Present: Mr. Mallory, Chairman, Mr. Fish, Mr. Slidell, Mr. Bell.

The consideration of Mr. Bartlett's case was resumed.

H. J. Anderson, commissioner of customs, was duly sworn. Previous to his examination, Mr. Bartlett read and submitted the paper hereto annexed, marked F, and then withdrew from the committee room.

Lieutenant Thornton A. Jenkins, United States navy, and secretary Light-house Board, was now sworn and deposed as follows:

In October, 1854, the accounts of Bartlett for disbursements and personal expenses to and from and in Paris, while attending the construction of eight illuminating apparatus for the coast of California, under the written instructions of the Secretary of the Treasury, (hereto appended, marked G,) were referred to the Light-house Board for preliminary examination, and such a detailed report thereon as would enable the Secretary of the Treasury and accounting officers to decide upon the various charges contained therein. Bartlett came to witness' office subsequently to the receipt of these vouchers and accounts, and was told they had been so referred, of which reference he seemed to have been previously apprised.

On October 26, 1854, witness, as secretary of the Light-house Board, addressed a letter to Bartlett, informing him of the fact that his accounts were before the board for action, &c. To this letter no reply was received.—(Copy of letter hereto annexed, marked H.) Witness again wrote Bartlett, (see letter, copy of which is hereto annexed, marked I.) Bartlett promptly replied to this last letter, expressing his willingness to explain, and desire for settlement, &c. Shortly after receipt of this, his reply, Bartlett came to the office, early in the morning, and spent the time there that day until nearly nine o'clock at night. During that day and evening he (B.) spoke almost continuously of his trip to Paris, his accounts, &c., without being specific, evidently with a view to elicit from witness the opinion of the Light-house Board relative to his personal expenses account on said trip, &c. Witness informed Bartlett, in as delicate a manner as possible, what he (witness) conceived to be the general opinion of the members of the Light-house Board, all of whom (except the Secretary of the Treasury and Professor Bache) were present at the meeting of said board when Bartlett's accounts were examined and discussed. Witness even pointed out to Bartlett certain vouchers which he thought very exceptionable. Finally, Bartlett asked him what he should do. Witness told him frankly and promptly that he ought to withdraw all of his vouchers for personal expenses. Bartlett then asked if he was to lose all his personal expenses. Witness replied: By no means. That his instructions comprised a maximum limit, and witness had no doubt that if Bartlett, as he said, could satisfy the Secretary of the Treasury that his expenses had been greater than that maximum, he would make as just and liberal an allowance as possible. Bartlett then addressed a letter to the Secretary of the Treasury, and filed it in lieu of his accounts and vouchers, which he withdrew. The vouchers for disbursements were then properly stated and sent to the Secretary of the Treasury with Bartlett's letter, submitting his claim for personal expenses, and the report of the Light-house Board thereon, (hereto appended, marked K.) Bartlett claimed $4,011 dollars for personal expenses, covering 27 months. The particular vouchers to which Bartlett's attention was called by

witness were, his bill at Fenton's hotel, London, for 2½ days board and expenses $45, which now appears to have been altered to $34 35; his vouchers for transportation of extra baggage, trip to Spurn lights, loss of baggage, and for medicine. The opinion of witness was that none of these would pass the board. Witness thought the vouchers submitted by Bartlett evidently included family expenses, and were, consequently, all objectionable. Bartlett was finally allowed 3 per cent. on expenditures, amounting to $2,700. After withdrawing his accounts, Bartlett told witness he had restored them.

Witness and Lieutenant Richard Bates travelled over Europe, visiting nearly every place where a light-house was located, and spent 10 or 11 months thus, and their joint expenses were about $2,000, and they were nearly constantly in motion.

H. J. Anderson, commissioner of customs, being sworn, deposed as follows:

The charge of Lieutenant Bartlett, at Fenton's hotel, London, was reduced by my direction, there being a charge for parlor, not deemed necessary, and the alteration in the voucher was probably made in consequence of that decision, as I think it was made known to him on the first presentation of his account.

The charges for transportation of extra baggage, medical attention, and medicines were also disallowed.

The aggregate charges in Lieutenant Bartlett's account amounted to $4,011 70. The sum stipulated for his expenses at the time of his appointment was a sum not exceeding three per cent. upon his expenditures, which per centage amounted to $2,712 42 In addition to the disallowances above stated, a sum sufficient to make the difference between these sums was also disallowed.

The whole sum allowed Mr. Bartlett was $2,712 42. The estimated expense of transportation from Washington to Paris *via* New York, Liverpool, and London and back, was $500, which would cover $2,212 42 for his personal expenses in Paris during the twenty-six months of his residence in that city. This would be $2 83 per day.

Commander J. S. Misroon, United States navy, being duly sworn, deposed as follows:

Question. State the grounds upon which the board acted and decided Mr. Bartlett's case?

Answer. The character in the navy of Mr. Bartlett was known to several members of the board as defective in some of the essential qualities necessary to the honor, and therefore to the efficiency, of an officer.

It appeared in the four several and separate investigations of his case, which occurred on the 3d, 11th, 12th, and 13th July, 1855, and upon the personal knowledge of several members, and by official papers on file, and by a copy of an official letter retained in the hands of a member, sustained by his personal knowledge of some of the prominent facts, and his belief in others, that certain matters of notoriety in regard to the conduct of Mr. Bartlett on board the Portsmouth, especially, were founded in fact.

The board also were influenced by an examination of certain ac-

counts and papers on file in the Treasury Department, recently rendered by Mr. Bartlett for his expenses in Paris, which were not admitted by the department until altered, and certain charges for items in which were deemed discreditable to Mr. Bartlett as an officer.

It was known to one or more members of the board, that his conduct, on board of the surveying schooner Ewing, was discreditable to him, and believed to have been dishonest.

It appeared to the board that Mr. Bartlett failed to insist upon or demand investigation into the charges made against him in an official letter, dated October 16, 1846, on board the Portsmouth, although a court sat on board the vessel competent to his trial in November, 1847.

Question. What was the standing of Mr. Bartlett among his peers on that station at that time?

Answer. By no means creditable to him. I learned that several officers in the squadron declined being attached to the Portsmouth on account of an association with Mr. Bartlett. Mr. Bartlett possesses certain good qualities, of an obliging and amiable disposition, always ready to render service, and zealous in attending to his duty.

Question. State the cause of his bad standing?

Answer. I believe that he was considered unreliable, and the course of his messmates towards him shows that his honor and honesty was, at least, doubtful, if not entirely distrusted.

Question. Were there any special cases of dishonesty?

Answer. He was placed in Coventry for transactions believed to be dishonest, and which he failed to explain satisfactorily, when aware of those doubts of his honesty by his messmates; but I would rather that other members of the mess now in the country should answer to this enquiry.

Question. What was his standing as a seaman?

Answer. I think he knows his profession very well. He labors under disadvantage in being easily flurried or thrown off his balance when unexpectedly called upon to act.

Question. State what knowledge you possessed, or upon what you relied, to prove the charges set forth against Mr. Bartlett in your official letter of October 16, 1846.

Answer. In the case of selling goods to his brother officers from his state room, I know, by the remarks of Dr. Chase, that Mr. Bartlett sold some cloth to him; and from Mr. Delazon Smith, a public functionary of the United States, that he had purchased shirts and other articles of Mr. Bartlett, for which a bill was duly rendered as "Bought of Lieutenant Washington A. Bartlett." I heard, at the time, of many other instances of sales of clothing and segars.

When spoken to officially by me, as the executive officer of the Portsmouth, of the impropriety of his conduct in regard to the above, Mr. Bartlett did not deny the charge, but stated that it was done as an accommodation to others.

In the case of soliciting subscriptions to his library, I heard it stated by the individuals themselves to whom he applied; among others, Mr. Delazon Smith and Dr. Chase stated that he had asked for $5 for the perusal of his books, and it was notorious that both these gentlemen were merely passengers to the Pacific. It became

known to me, in the exercise of my official duties, that Mr. Bartlett had authorized a subscription list to be circulated among the crew of the Portsmouth, contrary to my express order issued to Mr. Bartlett, that no such list should so issue until the crew could examine the books gratuitously furnished them by government. When detected in the disobedience of a proper order, he endeavored, but failed, to show that he had not authorized the circulation of the subscription list among the crew.

In the case of selling an article of dress to a lady in Monterey, Purser Watmough informed me of the facts substantially as specified in my letter of October 16, 1846, adding that he had received the information from the lady in question.

When questioned by me on the subject, Mr. Bartlett did not deny having sold the article to the lady, nor did he deny the price, which it was said he had received for it. But he endeavored to excuse the sale by stating that he did not want it, that it required attention to preserve it, and that the lady desired to possess it. He did not deny having smuggled it to the shore when I remarked that he was open to the charge of having smuggled the article under his uniform into a foreign country; nor did he reply to my comments upon the exorbitant advance he had received upon its cost, which I happened to be aware of. He appeared to be much affected by the detection, and expressed the hope that no further notice should be taken of the matter.

I reported all these several circumstances to the commander of the ship as they occurred, which concluded my duty as an executive officer. In consequence of the defiant tone of Mr. Bartlett, on a subsequent occasion, I offered, in my letter of October 16, 1846, to frame charges upon these reports, which letter is now before the committee.

Question. What were the particular circumstances and items which attracted the attention of the board in the accounts of Mr. Bartlett as rendered to the Treasury Department, and which were considered disreputable to him?

Answer. The accounts were submitted to the Light-house Board for examination. It appeared that the vouchers were of a character which could never pass with the approval of the Light-house Board, and he was afforded an opportunity to withdraw or explain them. It was known to several members of the board, who were attached to the light-house service, that he had rendered accounts claiming more money than it was understood he should receive for that duty; and that he had admitted, on the examination of his accounts, virtually, that the items charged embraced the expenses of his wife and children also. That, by advice, he had withdrawn the charges or accounts, but had afterwards reproduced them, and that they then appeared on file in the Treasury Department. These accounts were found to contain exorbitant charges, and impressed the board unfavorably of his honesty, viz: He claimed expenses for constructing *sixty-three* light-house illuminators, but he was ordered to attend to no other duty than to enter into contracts, &c., for eight illuminating apparatus, under an order dated July 16, 1852. A charge appeared for office of agency in Paris, when no office was authorized nor required; and it appeared by another bill, that this office was the quarters of himself and family.

A charge for visiting English lights, which visit was unauthorized. A charge for parlor in London. Fenton's bill for $34 25, for two and a half days' board; originally charged $45. Doorkeeper and messenger for two years. Servant's hire, which appeared to have been made out after his return home; which, if presented at all, should have been charged as paid. Druggist's bill, &c.

It was known that Mr. Bartlett was to be allowed his reasonable expenses, not, however, to *exceed* three per cent. upon his expenditures, and that he could not properly claim a sum exceeding $2,700; yet, that his original claim exceeded $4,000. He was on duty pay the while.

It is not considered honorable in the navy for an officer to present accounts which he cannot adhere to.

Question. State the vote by which Mr. Bartlett was separated from the active list; and also the vote by which he was dropped?

Answer. He was separated from the active list by a vote of 14 to 1. And was dropped by 13 votes, 1 leave, 1 furlough.

Dr. A. A. Henderson, passed assistant surgeon United States navy, being duly sworn, deposed as follows:

He joined the ship Portsmouth early in 1846. Had never met Bartlett before. Had a decided conviction at the time the letter of October 8, 1846, to which his name was signed, was written, that Bartlett was dishonest. When Bartlett submitted his accounts as caterer of the mess of the Portsmouth there was a want of a proper series of vouchers. From the action of the mess it must have been evident to Bartlett that his messmates entertained doubt of his honesty in disbursing the mess funds. Instead of meeting this in a manly and straightforward spirit, he seemed to be depressed and to endeavor to shrink from an investigation. In the vouchers submitted by him certain daily expenditures were charged for marketing, which the ward-room steward asserted were incorrect and too large. This, upon being pointed out to Bartlett, was altered by him to suit the assertions of the steward, (by changing and deducting amounts in certain items and adding to others,) although the aggregate amount remained unchanged. Having this conviction, (of Bartlett's dishonesty,) witness, with other members of the mess, joined in writing a note to Bartlett, (see B,) which led to the subsequent correspondence now before the committee, (B.) Upon carrying this note to Lieutenant Misroon for his signature, he at first objected, from motives of pity and compassion; but, upon having it pointed out to him that his signature was absolutely necessary, he was induced to sign it.

Witness associated freely with officers of the navy on Pacific coast, and had opportunities of learning Bartlett's standing among his peers. It was bad. He was often spoken of contemptuously, and was regarded as deficient in the spirit of a gentleman. It was the conviction of witness that Bartlett declined urging his own trial, fearing to meet the result.

Committee adjourned.

THURSDAY, March 14, 1856.

The committee met and resumed the consideration of Mr. Bartlett's case.

Present: Mr. Mallory, chairman, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Fish, Mr. Slidell, Mr. Bell.

Dr. Marius Duval, passed assistant surgeon United States navy, being duly sworn, deposed as follows:

He joined the Portsmouth at Mazatlan. Bartlett was lieutenant on board of her. Had never met him before; was perfect stranger to him. Was on board the Portsmouth about six months. About the time witness joined the vessel Bartlett told him that his mess account would be, for initiation, $43, and regular account, $30, all of which witness paid him. On the arrival of the vessel at Monterey, the purser informed witness that Bartlett had drawn $30 on witness' account, for mess, &c. In less than two months the mess were surprised to find that there were no mess stores. Bartlett was broke and another caterer chosen.

The mess asked Bartlett for a statement of his account, but he could not render a satisfactory one. However, he did make a statement, which contained inconsistencies that were pointed out to him. He thereupon altered it in various particulars, but only made it more confused. Witness thought this a perfectly dishonest transaction on the part of Bartlett. Bartlett attempted to make explanations, but they were unsatisfactory. The mess charged him with dishonesty. He looked like a culprit, and could hardly hold his head up. Indeed, his condition was so abject, that it excited a good deal of commisseration in some of the mess.

Perhaps the mess would have arrived at a different conclusion had not Bartlett been a ready penman and good at figures, and particularly careful in matters where his own money was directly concerned. After these transactions, Bartlett went on shore and attempted to create the impression that he was popular with the mess.

Witness associated freely with officers of the navy while he was on Pacific coast. Before witness knew Bartlett he had heard of him, and he was always spoken of contemptuously. As a general thing he was looked upon in the squadron as a very dishonest and dishonorable person.

The mess of the Portsmouth consisted of nine members. At the time letter October 8, 1846, was written, some of the mess were engaged on shore duty. All of the mess on board at the time signed said letter.

Knows nothing further, &c.

Committee adjourned.

MONDAY, May 19, 1856.

Present: Mr. Mallory, chairman, Mr. Thomson, Mr. Fish, Mr. Bell, Mr. Slidell.

The committee resumed the consideration of Mr. W. A. Bartlett's case.

Mr. Bartlett presented to the chairman the letter hereto annexed, marked L, which was read.

Professor A. D. Bache was now sworn and examined:

Question 1, *by chairman.* Have you any knowledge, directly or indirectly, touching the sale of a shawl by Mr. Bartlett at Monterey in 1846?

Answer. None.

Question 2. Have you any knowledge, directly or indirectly, touching the discharge of Mr. Bartlett's duties as caterer of the ward-room mess of the United States ship Portsmouth?

Answer. None.

Question 3. Have you any knowledge, directly or indirectly, touching the alleged illegal introduction by Mr. Bartlett into San Francisco, while in command of the Ewing, of certain merchandise by him?

Answer. I was Mr. Bartlett's official chief while he was in command of the United States schooner Ewing, and no report was made to me of any such circumstances, either by Lieutenant McArthur United States navy, in command of the hydrographic party, to which the Ewing was attached, or by any of the officers of the vessel. I have no recollection of hearing of such a matter until recently.

* * * * * * * *

Here the chairman put the questions to the witness, as contained in paper marked B, hereto annexed, submitted by Mr. Bartlett, to which witness replied as follows:

Answer 1. I am superintendent of the coast survey of the United States, and have held that position since 1844.

Answer 2. I do. By correspondence since he took command of the coast survey schooner Ewing in 1849, and personally since his return from the coast of California and Oregon in 1850, as attached to the coast survey, and while serving as special agent of the Treasury Department in regard to procuring Fresnel apparatus for light-houses in France.

Answer 3. He was.

Answer 4. Entirely to my satisfaction and that of Lieutenant Commanding William P. McArthur. In justice to Mr. Bartlett, I should state briefly what those services were. He took the schooner Ewing, a small vessel, which had been used in the revenue service as a cutter, from New York to San Francisco. Was active in pursuing the mutineers who attempted to drown Passed Midshipman Gibson, of the schooner Ewing. Went to Columbia river with Lieutenant Commanding McArthur, though it was understood that unless a second vessel were attached to the coast survey he was to return home. Was active in the survey of Columbia river and the reconnoissance of the western coast. The letters from Lieutenant Commanding McArthur express his sense of Lieutenant Bartlett's services, and refer to him for important information in regard to the coast, showing his confidence in him. He assisted assiduously in preparing the coast survey charts of the western coast at the office.

Answer 5. It was, in my judgment, and in that of his immediate commanding officer, Lieutenant William P. McArthur.

Answer 6. No such report was ever made to me.

Answer 7. Such was my wish, founded upon the estimate which I placed upon his services.

Answer 8. No such report has been made to me. I include rumors, of course, in speaking of reports.

Answer 9. Resting myself upon the facts in regard to his services on board the schooner Ewing, as far as any service of which I have charge is concerned, I do. These facts are, the voyage around the Horn, and the manner in which subsequent difficulties in the survey were met.

Answer 10. I have.

Answer 11. My impressions have been of a favorable character.

Answer 12. As far as my knowledge has extended personally, it has been such as to commend him to my sympathies and esteem. In this I do not express an opinion in regard to the course in his present difficulties; this I do not understand to be in question.

Answer 13. In all transactions of which I have personal knowledge he has, in my judgment, acted uprightly. I have not undertaken to judge of rumors.

Answer 14. No such report was made to me, nor did I hear such a report until recently. Lieutenant McArthur neither said nor did anything leading me to believe that Lieut. Bartlett had acted improperly.

Answer 15. Lieutenant McArthur was one of the most sterling officers I ever knew; upright, frank, and honorable in all his dealings. He is the very kind of officer from whom I should have expected reprobation of delinquencies of any sort, but especially those touching honor. He met the very severe trials to which he was put, in beginning the survey of the western coast, in the most admirable manner. I do not think he could have failed to report any act of delinquency touching the honor of the officers of the party under his charge.

Answer 16. His character and conduct, as far as this can come to my personal knowledge, have merited my approbation.

Commodore Thomas Ap Catesby Jones was now sworn and examined.

Question 1, *by chairman*. Have you any knowledge, directly or indirectly, touching the sale of a shawl by Mr. Bartlett, at Monterey.

Answer. I know nothing of the subject, of my own knowledge.

Question 2. Have you any knowledge, directly or indirectly, touching the discharge of Mr. Bartlett's duties as caterer of the ward-room mess of the United States ship Portsmouth.

Answer. None.

Question 3. Have you any knowledge, directly or indirectly, touching the alleged illegal introduction, by Mr. Bartlett, into San Francisco, while in command of the Ewing, of certain merchandise by him.

Answer. None whatever.

* * * * * * * *

Here the chairman put questions to witness, as contained in paper marked N, (hereto annexed,) submitted by Mr. Bartlett, to which witness replied as follows:

Answer 1. I answer in the affirmative.

Answer 2. I answer in the affirmative.

Answer 3. I never did.

Question 4. Was not put, as being irrelevant.

Question 5. As far down as the word "command," on line 10, was not put.

To the balance of said question, which was put, the witness answered as follows:

I knew Lieutenant McArthur very well. I never heard him say anything against Mr. Bartlett. My impression is that McArthur had full confidence in Bartlett. I am not aware that any occasion arose when it was necessary to express an opinion. I never heard McArthur say anything against Bartlett.

Question 6. Not put.

Question 7. I have known Mr. Bartlett, and met him occasionally as an officer, from the time he was a midshipman. I have never been associated with him on duty, but frequently met with him on the coast of California, while he was in command of the Ewing, which vessel he brought around Cape Horn in good and proper order. And from the year that we were on said coast, from August, 1849, to July, 1850, I never saw nor heard anything impeaching Bartlett's capacity as an officer, or derogatory to his character as a gentleman, except the rumors about the mess affairs of the Portsmouth.

Question by chairman. What were the rumors?

Answer. That he had had some difficulty with the mess.

Question by chairman. Do you recollect the character of the rumors?

Answer. Something about mess accounts and selling clothes. The same rumor represented that Captain Montgomery was satisfied about these matters.

Question 8. I only know that the Ewing, which he commanded, arrived in good order around Cape Horn. His requisitions for supplies were moderate, showing that no material accident or waste of his stores had taken place. There were no complaints made to me by any officer on board of any misconduct.

Mr. A. C. Rhind (late United States navy) was now sworn and examined:

Question 1, *by chairman.* Have you any knowledge, directly or indirectly, touching the sale of a shawl by Mr. Bartlett, at Monterey, in 1856?

Answer. I know nothing about Mr. Bartlett's transactions previously to my personal acquaintance with him. My acquaintance with him was made in 1849, subsequent to his cruise in the Portsmouth.

Question 2. Have you any knowledge, directly or indirectly, touching the discharge of Mr. Bartlett's duties as caterer of the ward-room mess of the United States ship Portsmouth?

Answer. Answered above.

Question 2. Have you any knowledge, directly or indirectly, touching the alleged illegal introduction by Mr. Bartlett into San Francisco, while in command of the Ewing, of certain merchandise by him?

Answer. The first intimation I had of any such charge against Mr.

Bartlett I received in a note from Captain Dupont, while the late Naval Board was in session.

* * * * * * * *

Here the chairman put the questions to witness as contained in paper marked O, (hereto annexed,) submitted by Mr. Bartlett, to which witness replied as follows:

Answer 1. My rank in 1848–'49 was passed midshipman and master, (acting.)

Question 2. Was not put.

Answer 3. They are substantially correct

Answer 4. I know nothing personally of Mr. Bartlett's transactions out there, while I was associated with him on duty, which impeached his honesty in any degree.

Answer 5. Mr. Bartlett discharged all his duties to his government with a degree of ability quite equal to the average of his rank in the service, perhaps superior to many.

Answer 6. I understood from Mr. Bartlett, previous to the departure of the vessel from New York, that Mr. M. Murphy, the draughtsman, would discharge the duties of acting purser. I presume, however, Mr. Bartlett was the responsible individual. I had nothing to do with this department.

Question 7. Was not put.

Answer 8. The vessel, boats, and crew were never, to my knowledge, used for any such purpose. On one occasion I had been on shore in San Francisco on duty, on my return on board I missed one of the boats and crew. I inquired of the officer of the deck where the boat was, and understood that she had been sent by Mr. Bartlett on board of another vessel to assist in breaking out some articles. The boat returned shortly after, and, as I understood, without having accomplished the desired object, either from the absence of the captain, or the person who was to attend to the delivery of the goods. I objected to the boats being sent on such duty, because I did not consider it as appertaining exclusively to the service of the vessel. Whether I stated my objections particularly to Mr. Bartlett, I do not recollect, but they were expressed to the officers generally, and, I think, to Mr. Bartlett personally. The boat was never, to my knowledge, sent back, nor did the crew ever perform any such service, so far as I know. My position there was such that I never would have permitted any such infractions of the requirements of the service, and none such ever occurred. This had almost entirely escaped my recollection, but was recently recalled to my mind by a conversation had (I think, in February last) with Lieutenant C. Simms, one of the officers of the vessel. The name of the vessel to which the boat was sent was the John G. Costar, last from Valparaiso, I think.

Question 9. Was not put.

Answer 10. I was.

Answer 11. I was associated with Mr. Bartlett about nine months. Our intercourse was altogether official. As to Mr. Bartlett's efficiency as an officer, in all respects, I regard him as equal to, perhaps above, the average of his grade; and as to his character, I know nothing reflecting on him or impeaching his honesty as a man. I had been

prejudiced against him, by rumors generally circulated in the service, touching his actions while on a cruise in the Portsmouth, previous to my personal acquaintance with him. These prejudices, and perhaps a difference of disposition, are the reasons, in part, of our former intercourse having then been altogether official. Mr. Bartlett never particularly cultivated my acquaintance, nor I his.

Commander C. Ringgold was now sworn and examined:

Question 1, *by chairman.* Have you any knowledge, directly or indirectly, touching the sale of a shawl by Mr. Bartlett, at Monterey, in 1846?

Answer. None but general rumor.

Question 2. Have you any knowledge, directly or indirectly, touching the discharge of Mr. Bartlett's duties as caterer of the ward-room mess of the United States ship Portsmouth?

Answer. Nothing but rumor.

Question 3. Have you any knowledge, directly or indirectly, touching the alleged illegal introduction, by Mr. Bartlett, into San Francisco, while in command of the Ewing, of certain merchandise by him?

Answer. None whatever. It is singular that, during the whole time from May, 1849, to July, 1850, while there, I never heard anything about it. I heard it when I returned to Washington, I think, in 1850.

* * * * * * * * *

Here the chairman put questions, submitted by Mr. Bartlett, and contained in paper hereto annexed, marked P, to which witness replied as follows:

Answer 1. I was commander in California in 1849 and 1850. Mr. Bartlett arrived there in command of the Ewing a month or two after I did.

Answer 2. Same as above.

Questions 3 and 4 not put.

Answer 5. Same as answer 1.

Answer 6. Such things might or might not have occurred without my knowledge. At the same time, my acquaintance was very extensive among the residents and officers of the army and navy.

Answer 7. I did not until I returned to Washington.

Answer 8. I answer affirmatively.

Answer 9. I first met Mr. Bartlett in 1849. I have never been associated with him on duty. My prejudices were very much excited against him in consequence of the rumors I had heard in 1850 or 1851. While in California I heard Bartlett spoken of as a very shrewd business man. My appreciation of his character was greatly against him from rumors I had heard from officers of the navy from time to time. Not from personal knowledge of these facts. Subsequent personal acquaintance and intercourse with Mr. Bartlett has not caused me to doubt his general character for honor, integrity, and truthfulness, nor confirmed the prejudices arising from the rumors mentioned.

Captain J. B. Montgomery was now sworn and examined:

Question 1, *by chairman.* Have you any knowledge, directly or in-

directly, touching the sale of a shawl by Mr. Bartlett, at Monterey, in 1846?

Answer. My first knowledge, to the best of my recollection, of the transaction, was conveyed in an official letter from certain officers of the Portsmouth to myself, of date October 16, 1846.

Question 2. Have you any knowledge, directly or indirectly, touching the discharge of Mr. Bartlett's duties as caterer of the ward-room mess of the United States ship Portsmouth?

Answer. None but such as was derived from the letter above alluded to.

Question 3. Have you any knowledge, directly or indirectly, touching the alleged illegal introduction, by Mr. Bartlett, into San Francisco, while in command of the Ewing, of certain merchandise by him?

Answer. None.

* * * * * * * * *

Here the chairman put the questions, as submitted by Mr. Bartlett in paper hereto annexed, marked Q, and to which the witness replied as follows:

Answer 1. I have known Mr. Bartlett since 1838, when he reported to me for duty (he being then a midshipman) on board the receiving-ship at Boston. Can't say how long he was with me, probably ten or twelve months. He subsequently reported to me as master (afterwards promoted to lieutenant) of the Portsmouth, at Portsmouth, New Hampshire, in the latter part of 1844, and continued to serve under my command until the discharge of the crew in 1848. I have known Mr. Bartlett from that time to the present, but have not been associated with him on duty, except as above stated.

Answer 2. Nothing ever came to my knowledge, except as stated in my answers to the first and second questions. I regarded the charges as of a most serious and blighting character. But Bartlett, who first brought it to my knowledge in a letter to me, enclosing the letter from a portion of the mess, met the imputations in so prompt and proper a spirit, expressing his desire and readiness to refute them, that I was led to hope that he would be able to do so. I never yielded my mind to any conviction of the truth of the allegations against Bartlett, nor have I to this day.

Answer 3. Affirmatively.

Answer 4. On the termination of our cruise in the Portsmouth, there were three or four officers on board the ship, against whom reports had been made at various times, all of which, except in Bartlett's case, had been settled. As our official relations were about to cease, I sent for those officers and handed them the papers, &c., referring to their respective cases, saying to them, in substance, "these are all the papers, containing anything to your disadvantage, that are in my possession; the cruise having terminated, I have no further use for them." I never expressed any judgment to Bartlett or any one else about the matter referred to in his interrogatory. The statement alluded to is, consequently, not correct.

Answer 5. I regard him as a competent and efficient officer in all respects. I know nothing, personally, against his character as a man.

Answer 6. No.
Answer 7. I do not.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 21, 1856.

The committee met and resumed the consideration of Mr. Bartlett's case.

Present: Mr. Mallory, chairman, Mr. Bell, Mr. Fish, Mr. Thomson.

Mr. James W. Bingham was now sworn and examined.

Question 1, *by chairman*. Have you any knowledge, directly or indirectly, touching the sale of a shawl by Mr. Bartlett, at Monterey, in 1846?

Answer. Not any.

Question 2. Have you any knowledge, directly or indirectly, touching the discharge of Mr. Bartlett's duties as caterer of the ward-room mess of the United States ship Portsmouth?

Answer. Not any.

Question 3. Have you any knowledge, directly or indirectly, touching the alleged illegal introduction, by Mr. Bartlett, into San Francisco, while in command of the Ewing, of certain merchandise by him?

Answer. I have.

Here the chairman put questions to witness, as contained in paper marked R, (hereto annexed,) submitted by Mr. Bartlett, to which witness replied as follows:

Answer 1. Said affidavit was made by me.

Answer 2. It is correct.

Answer 3. I know of none, and think I should know had there been any.

Answer 4. No.

Answer 5. As far as I ever knew or know, it was honorable in the highest degree. I was his partner for nearly three years, associated with him in business in San Francisco.

* * * * * * * *

The business was a general mercantile and commission business, and on our own account. We bought and sold provisions, groceries, and dry goods. This was in 1849, 1850, and 1851. The receipt, to which I testify, refers to boots, shoes, and sailors' clothing. They were imported from Valparaiso. The goods were imported on Mr. Bartlett's individual account. We sold them and passed the amount to his credit, charging him commission as we would any stranger. We had nothing to do with these goods but to receive them We received them as we would from any other stranger. This was the only instance I ever knew where Bartlett imported goods on his own account. The value of the goods was between $700 and $800.

The duties on them were not paid, according to the best of my recollection. They were entered as being intended for the United States seamen, and therefore free.

For interrogatories proposed to be propounded to E. H. Harrison, by Mr. Bartlett, and the action of the committee thereon, see S.

T and U and V are copies of interrogatories submitted by Mr. Bartlett to be propounded to Captain A. V. Fraser, and J. W. Revere, and Henry B. Watson, esqs., but, as they did not attend the committee before the examination of the case had been concluded, they were not examined. W and X are copies of letters from Captain Fraser to the committee, and the reply thereto.

THE MEMORIAL OF WASHINGTON ALLON BARTLETT, LATE A LIEUTENANT IN THE NAVY, SETTING FORTH THE SERVICES HE HAS PERFORMED IN THE NAVY AS AN EFFICIENT OFFICER, AND ASKING TO BE RESTORED TO HIS ORIGINAL POSITION ON THE NAVY LIST, WITH AN APPENDIX OF OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS.

To the Hon. The Senate and House of Representatives
Of the United States in Congress assembled:

The petition of Washington Allon Bartlett, a citizen of the State of Maine, and resident in the State of New York, late a lieutenant in the navy of the United States, respectfully representing:

That, on the 22d of January, in the year 1833, your memorialist was appointed a midshipman in the navy, having had some previous nautical training at sea; and was ordered, in April of that year, to commence his service at sea, by joining the Vincennes sloop-of-war for a cruise on the Pacific ocean, which cruise was extended to a period of four years and twelve days, your memorialist returning in the frigate Brandywine—Commodore Wadsworth's flag-ship—commanded by Captain D. Deacon, on the 12th May, 1837.

That from that period till July, 1839, your memorialist was variously employed "afloat and ashore," and in preparing for examination to the grade of passed-midshipman, which examination was successfully passed by your memorialist, July the 8th, 1839, your memoralist obtaining a high rank in his class, being warranted No. 7 in a class of thirty-two; and that then your memorialist was again ordered to sea for the "survey of southern harbors," and at the instance of the Navy Department your memorialist was continued upon surveying duty, mostly at sea, either on surveys specially ordered by acts of Congress, or in the department of the "Coast Survey," until November, A. D. 1844, when your memorialist was commissioned a lieutenant in the navy, and ordered to the sloop-of-war "Portsmouth," Commander John B. Montgomery, for another cruise on the Pacific ocean, which cruise your memorialist successfully performed, participating in all the incidents of the war in Mexico in which the Pacific squadron took part, and which obtained for the United States the Territory of California, and the subjugation of the western coast of Mexico; which cruise of three years and six months was ended on the 15th day of May, A. D. 1848, or the close of the war.

Your memorialist further represents, that in November of the same year he was selected to command the United States schooner "Ewing," for an expedition into the Pacific; and again your memorialist passed Cape Horn, and reported his command off San Francisco, ready to

commence the survey of the western coast of the United States, then commanding (August, 1849) the attention of the whole commercial world; and that Lieutenant Commanding William P. McArthur, assistant in the coast survey, having charge of the hydrography of the western coast, (arriving out in September,) being then ready to proceed with the work, your memorialist seconded with all possible zeal the ardent efforts of the commandant of the expedition, so that before the close of 1850 (being well sustained by the officers engaged on the work) your memorialist was enabled to return and report to the distinguished chief of the coast survey, that notwithstanding all the difficulties, almost insurmountable, under which the expedition had suffered from the excessive temptations to desert, a partial mutiny of the crew, (and other causes which paralyzed every branch of the public service in that region,) and the exploration of a coast but little known, with the survey of the Columbia river, (up to that period known only to mariners by its difficulties and disasters, where two United States vessels-of-war had been totally lost;) and that a good practicable, serviceable, and reliable chart of the entire coast of Oregon and California, from the Columbia river to Monterey, including the entrance to San Francisco, with a detailed survey of the mouth of the Columbia from sea to a point fifteen miles within the bar, had been made; which, on being presented to the superintendent, A. D. Bache, L.L.D., was approved, and published to the world, previous to the end of the year, as the joint production of the late lamented Lieut. Com'g Wm. P. McArthur and your memorialist.

And your memorialist avers, that for the successful accomplishment of that work, so laborious and dangerous in its execution—which so fully, completely, and safely opened the navigation of the Columbia river, producing results so incalculable in value to that heretofore sealed territory, and our general commerce—obtained for your memorialist, as the associate of McArthur, (who died from exposure on the work before he could see the published results of our labors,) high commendations from the superintendent of the coast survey, Professor A. D. Bache, L.L.D., from the Navy Department, from the committees of Congress,(which passed increased appropriations for the continuance of the survey of the western coast,) from the citizens of Oregon and California, and the commercial interests of the country.

Your memorialist avers, that he only retired from the command of the work now tendered to him—consequent upon McArthur's decease, because your memorialist had been serving on the Pacific for six consecutive years—in all ten years and a half in that sea—and his family now needed his personal attention.

In this important work, strictly professional and creditable to the navy, your memorialist had at all times used his utmost zeal and abilities to sustain the declining health of the chief of the expedition, and prosecute the work to a successful result; that result is before the world; its value has been everywhere admitted. And your memorialist further says, that being detached from the coast survey, July, 1832, your memorialist, with the full concurrence of the honorable the Secretary of the Navy, was employed by the Treasury Department to proceed to Europe as "special agent" under its orders, with large powers to con-

tract for and superintend the construction of the *Fresnel lens lights*, ordered by Congress to be illumininated on the western coast of the United States; and that having completed that duty, and closed his disbursement accounts on the books of the treasury, to the entire satisfaction of the honorable the Secretary of the Treasury, in February, 1855, your memorialist was again ordered to sea as a lieutenant, and served cheerfully and faithfully as lieutenant, and as first lieutenant, and executive officer of the flag-ship of the African squadron, up to the 28th day of October last, when your memorialist received (being then on board of said flag-ship at the Cape de Verde islands,) a copy of the following communication, which the honorable the Secretary had addressed to the wife of your memorialist:

"NAVY DEPARTMENT, *September* 20, 1855.

"MADAM: Your letter of the 18th instant has been received. The Board of Naval Officers, recently convened in Washington in accordance with the law, merely reported the names and ranks of officers who, in their judgment, came within the provisions of the recent act of Congress, but not the facts or the grounds upon which their action was based. No charges were preferred against any officer. You will perceive, therefore, that I am unable to comply with your request to know what the charges were against Lieutenant Bartlett.

"I am, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

"J. C. DOBBIN.

"Mrs. WASHINGTON BARTLETT, *New York*."

Thus ended the service of your memorialist. The whole period of service of your memorialist in the navy was *twenty-two years and nine months*, of which *thirteen years* and *nine months* have been passed in *actual sea service*, seven years on "other duty," and only two years "unemployed;" but this time rated as "unemployed" was not passed in idleness, but in the prosecution of the study of the Spanish and French languages, the political history, laws, and decisions of the United States, and commercial, admiralty, and international law, the better to prepare your memorialist for the intelligent performance of those duties which subsequent years and higher rank should impose upon him.

And your memorialist further says, that while the conquest and pacification of California was in progress, your memorialist being then a lieutenant of the "Portsmouth," and having assisted in the taking possession of the northern department of California, was called by Commander Montgomery, commandant of the northern department, *by the election of the people*, (at the first election held under our flag in the Territory,) and by the approval and full concurrence of Commodore the Hon. Robert F. Stockton, governor and commander-in-chief of the Territory, to the performance of functions of civil office and administration, of high trust and responsibility, to wit: To the office of the chief magistracy of the town and district of San Francisco, (September, 1846,) and judge of first instance; and by appointment to the office of "collector" and superintendent of the port, and judge in admiralty in all maritime cases occurring in the northern department. And your memorialist confidently avers, that he acquitted himself in

these various offices to the entire satisfaction of our government and the community, whether native or foreign, who flocked to that port, and ever received, and continues to receive, high praise for this service from the various chiefs who commanded the department, and the governor general, who were best informed of the severity and value of the labors of your memorialist; and your memorialist only surrendered the charge of these varied duties when the administration of the government of the Territory fell into the hands of the late General Kearny, and the naval forces proceeded to the occupation of Lower California, Sonora, and the coast of Mexico proper.

And your memorialist also avers, that it was in greatful remembrance of these well-performed services, in the early history of our occupation of that city and territory, since so famous as the great commercial wonder of our country, and the salutary and intelligent basis upon which the various archives were established, that in 1850 your memorialist was invited by the "bar" of San Francisco to present himself for examination as a counsellor of the supreme court of the State, and was duly qualified and commissioned as such; and your memorialist avers that this mark of consideration, esteem, and reward for civil service—*yet strictly a necessity of naval conquest*—was a compliment paid to his naval commission.

And your memorialist declares, that during his whole period of service he has done his whole duty, and ever been "*efficient*" both "ashore and afloat;" and that, a tno period of that service has any charge or complaint ever been brought against him by any *commander*, *captain*, or *commander-in-chief*, or the *Navy Department;* that your memorialist has never been made the subject of a naval court-martial or court of inquiry; ever arrested, suspended or reprimanded by any superior officer, since he has had the honor to hold an appointment or commission in the navy.

And your memorialist knows that he has ever had, and still has, the respect, confidence and esteem, as an officer and gentleman, of every *commander*, *captain*, or *commander-in-chief* under whom he has had the honor to serve in any capacity; the Secretaries of the Navy; the superintendent of the Coast Survey; ex-Governor General Joseph Lane, who was governor of Oregon while your memorialist served on the coast of that Territory, and the Hon. ex-Senator Stockton, late commodore and governor of California, than whom the army or navy never had more gallant and accomplished chieftains.

And your memorialist refers to the annexed documents, (A,) Appendix, to show in what manner your memorialist was held and esteemed as an *efficient* officer, by all his superior and junior officers, and the petty officers and crew of the present flag-ship of the African squadron, where your memorialist held the responsible and delicate post of first lieutenant and executive officer of a cruising frigate, down to the 28th October last, and where your memorialist would still be on "*sea service*," but for the action of the late "board."

But your memorialist has to state, that all this has availed him nothing to sustain him in his commission as an "efficient" officer of the navy; for by the act of Congress of the 28th February, A. D. 1855, entitled An act to promote the efficiency of the navy, a board of

officers was created, which "board," acted upon by some influence or allegations unknown to your memorialist and to the Navy Department—(see the letter of the 20th September, before quoted)—has recommended to the President of the United States that the name of your memorialist should be "stricken from the rolls," and in accordance with such reccommendation or opinion, unaccompanied by charges, facts, or proofs of any kind to direct the judgment of the executive, the name of your memorialist has been stricken from the rolls; and the information, so astonishing to your memorialist, reached him when in the full performance of his duties on the coast of Africa. Your memorialist, with the "regrets," and bearing with him the highest commendations of his commanders, brother officers, and crew, was permitted to return to the United States.

Your memorialist will not detain the Congress of the United States with any argument or proof of the baneful effects of this law upon the justice and sympathies of the country for its navy, and its still more baneful results upon the chivalry and *esprit du corps* of a service which has never had its escutcheon tarnished before the enemies of the country, but has now received a staggering blow from the mistaken zeal of its friends, urged on by a few within its own bosom, till an inquisitorial court has been created, and acted in a manner which shocks every sentiment of justice inherent in a free people.

It is sufficient for your memorialist to say, that he believes, (and in this opinion is sustained by the best legal talent of the country,) that the law itself is clearly within the description of "acts" so ably described by our great commentators, Marshall, Story, and Kent, in the great text-books of the law as ex post facto, and therefore unconstitutional; but if not unconstitutional, and therefore justly upon the statute as a measure of naval reform and progress, the more than extraordinary manner in which it has been executed, the department instructing the board that its action was only "advisory," and the President, that the finding of the board was "mandatory," or to that effect; hastily, inconsiderately, without notice to parties, without any pretence of having been guided by rules of evidence known to every schoolboy in the land, and in a manner so utterly repugnant to the great principles of civil liberty, or the laws of courts-martial, which guarantee that the accused shall have the RIGHT to confront his accusers and witnesses, and meet them face to face; that the law and its action is obnoxious to the great majority of those who have been *temporarily* benefitted by it; that without any of these *rights* being considered as attaching to the holder of an honorable commission, your memorialist has been assaulted in the dark, stricken down in secret, and has appealed in vain to know why and wherefore. See the annexed correspondence with the president of the board.

In that great charter of our liberties to which the names of John Hancock and Josiah Bartlett are attached, who, with Charles Carroll of Carrollton, and their immortal *associates*, "pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honors to maintain," leaving it as an imperishable legacy of honor and renown to their descendants, it is charged that one of the *high crimes* which England had committed against her loyal colonies was the transportation of colonial citizens

beyond sea, and putting them under trial, where they had no *counsel*, no *documents*, no *witnesses*, to sustain them in defence. This law and its execution has been less merciful, is less defensible, than those tyrannical acts—for the country furnished citizens with honorable commissions, and sent them abroad in its service to uphold the honor of the country, and cause her flag to be respected on dangerous seas and sickly coasts; and, as a reward for such service, well performed, and proudly stated to the world as the gallant conduct of American officers, "Rolando" and "Maffit" are "*furloughed;*" Maury is "retired;" "Stevens," "Walbach," "Sterrett," "Shaw," and scores of other meritorious and "efficient" officers, who are proving their efficiency at this moment, are retired, furloughed, or "dropped."

Therefore your memorialist appeals to the Congress of the nation to be heard in his defence, and his commission and original position in the navy—for which he has battled the enemies of his country, the storms of the ocean, and the pestilence of sickly coasts, (yet, through the mercy of God, possessed of a constitution and health which fits him for every duty, ashore or afloat)—shall be restored to him.

And your petitioner, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

WASH'N ALLON BARTLETT.

APPENDIX.

Letter from Commander F. B. Ellison, United States navy.

HEMPSTEAD, LONG ISLAND, *January* 17, 1856.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your request that I would state my opinion of your efficiency as an officer, and your deportment as a gentleman, during our recent association on board the "Jamestown," where you served under my command, I with great pleasure say, that in every particular, as a zealous and capable officer, and a well-informed, intelligent gentleman, I regarded you as most exemplary. Commodore Crabbe frequently expressed himself to me in very warm terms of you as a highly accomplished officer, and like expressions were made from all your messmates in the ward-room, showing a uniformity of opinion throughout the ship.

Sincerely trusting that the error which seems to have been made in your case may speedily be rectified, and that you may be honorably restored to your former position in the navy,

I am, very truly, your obedient servant and friend,

FRAS. B. ELLISON,
Commander United States navy.

W. A. BARTLETT, Esq., *Washington, D. C.*

Testimonial of Commodore Crabbe, United States navy.

UNITED STATES SHIP JAMESTOWN,
Porto Grande, October 23, 1855.

SIR: I have received your letter of this day's date, containing a copy of a letter from the honorable Secretary of the Navy to Mrs.

Bartlett, [the same published in the body of the memorial,] in relation to your retirement from the navy of the United States.

Although I have not received anything official from the department upon the subject, yet the honorable Secretary's letter to Mrs. Bartlett, and the reasons set forth by yourself, will no doubt justify me in relieving you from further duty on board this ship. In doing so, however, I cannot avoid saying that I deeply regret the loss of your services. Your gentlemanly and officer-like bearing, whilst under my command, has uniformly met my warmest approbation.

I am, with great respect, your obedient servant,

THOMAS CRABBE,

Commander-in-chief of United States naval forces, coast of Africa.

Lieutenant W. A. BARTLETT,

United States ship "Jamestown."

Testimonial of Lieutenant Commanding James F. Armstrong.

UNITED STATES FLAG-SHIP "JAMESTOWN,"

Porto Grande, St. Vincent, October 23, 1855.

DEAR SIR: In forwarding you the enclosed letter from Commodore Crabbe, relieving you from further duty in this ship, I beg leave to assure you of my deepest regret for the cause that has produced it, and for the interruption of an intercourse and association always confidential, harmonious, and friendly.

I shall ever esteem you in your character as an officer and gentleman, and in parting from you tender you my sincerest wishes for your restoration to the service and for your future welfare.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

JAS. FRANCIS ARMSTRONG,

Lieutenant Commanding.

Lieutenant WASH'N A. BARTLETT, *United States ship Jamestown.*

Testimonial of all the Commissioned Officers of the United States flag-ship Jamestown.

PORTO GRANDE, ST. VINCENT, *October* 24, 1855.

DEAR SIR: We entertain too high an appreciation of your character as a gentleman and an officer, and too warm a regard for you as a messmate and friend, to allow you to leave us without saying to you, in the sincerity of our hearts, that we deeply regret that you are about to part from us, and, above all, the cause that takes you away.

In the difficult and responsible relation that you have sustained to us, as executive officer of the ship, you have ever, whilst discharging your duties with fidelity, borne yourself towards us with the utmost frankness, conciliation, and courtesy. And, in the more intimate and kindly relation, as a member of the little society that we form amongst ourselves, and which can subsist in harmony only by mutual

cultivation of friendly feelings and the practice of friendly offices, you have endeared yourself to us by your uniform amiability of disposition, and by the desire you have ever evinced to cherish the most cordial intercourse with us all.

We therefore beg to assure you, that in parting from us you are taking leave of those who will ever remember you with pleasure, and who, whatever fortunes may betide you, will always continue your well-wishers and friends.

Ever, very truly, yours,

GEO. CLYMER, *Fleet Surgeon, ranking with Commander,*
T. H. PATTERSON, *Lieutenant,*
EDWARD N. BARNETT, *Lieutenant,*
T. M. TAYLOR, *Purser, (rank of Commander,)*
JULIAN MYERS, *Lieutenant,*
SAM'L RICH'D SWANN, *Assistant Surgeon,*
JOHN L. HEYLEN, *Commodore's Secretary,*
JNO. E. HART, *Acting Master and Lieutenant,*
JAS. M. BRADFORD, *Acting Lieutenant,*
CHAS. W. THOMAS, *Chaplain.*

Lieutenant WASHINGTON A. BARTLETT.

Letter from the Junior Officers of the Jamestown.

UNITED STATES SHIP JAMESTOWN,
Porto Grande, St. Vincent, October 24, 1855.

SIR: You are about to return to your home; in so doing the members of the steerage feel it their duty to express to you their deep regret, and their sincere gratitude for the extreme kindness with which you have universally treated them, during the time they have had the pleasure of being under your command. You may be assured that, after your leaving us, you will ever be cherished in our memory with feelings of the highest regard and esteem in your character as an officer and gentleman.

Sir, we bid you, with sorrow, a hearty farewell; with many wishes for your future welfare and happiness,

Believe us, very respectfully, your obedient servants,

N. B. CONCKLIN, *Master's Mate,*
C. W. LAWRENCE, *Master's Mate,*
VAL HALL VOORHEES, *Master's Mate,*
O. N. HENCKEL, *Master's Mate,*
H. B. JOHNSON, *Captain's Clerk.*

Lieutenant W. A. BARTLETT, *United States navy.*

Letter from the Warrant Officers of the United States ship Jamestown.

PORTO GRANDE, ST. VINCENT, *October* 26, 1855.

SIR: It is with feelings of the most heartfelt sorrow that we address these few lines to you.

You are about to return to your home, and we, as officers, who have taken pleasure in being under your command, cannot think of your leaving us without expressing our thanks for the gentlemanly manner in which we have been treated by you.

Your name may ever live fresh in our memories.

Hoping that you may succeed in all your undertakings, we remain, yours, truly,

WILLIAM COPE, *Gunner*,
JOHN MCKINLEY, *Boatswain*,
JOSEPH R. SMITH, *Carpenter*.

Lieutenant W. A. BARTLETT, *United States navy*.

Testimonial from the Petty Officers and Crew of the "Jamestown."

UNITED STATES SHIP JAMESTOWN,
Off Porto Grande, October 29, 1855.

SIR: In the discharge of my duties as sailmaker of this ship, I have learned much of the disposition of the crew, and the feeling they have toward you, particularly during the time you have served as executive officer, and beg leave to state that they, being aware of your intended departure for the States, have expressed a wish to me, and through me, to testify their regret that you have occasion to leave them prior to the end of the cruise.

Since I have been attached to the navy I have seen other officers who have gained the esteem of their ship's company, but never to such a degree as you have from the hardy sons of Neptune comprising this ship's crew. Your capabilities as a lieutenant, and your bearing as an officer and gentleman, have won their admiration, and they say they cannot let you depart without this token of their gratitude and their esteem.

Very respectfully, yours, &c.,
WM. N. MAUL, *Sailmaker*.

Approved—

WM. PLUMMER, *Captain Forecastle*.
JAMES YOUNG, *Captain Fore-top*.
HENRY P. GRACE, *Captain Main-top*.
CHARLES STEWART, *Captain Mizen-top*.
THOMAS W. MCCREADY, *Captain After-guard*.
THOMAS KITCHEN, *Captain Hold*.
DAVID ESBECK, *Signal Quartermaster*.
GEORGE POTTER, *Boatswain's Mate*.
WILLIAM THOMAS, *Sailmaker's Mate*.
JOHN H. LOVELESS, *Carpenter's Mate*.
DANIEL HUSSEY, *Gunner's Mate*.
JOHN D. GORMAN, *Master-at-arms*.
CHARLES SWANSON, *Yeoman*.
JAMES MCFARLAND, *Cooper*.

P. S.—They all wish to sign and approve, but as it would occupy too much time and too large a space, I could only permit one from each part of the ship, who bears testimony as to the sentiments of the gangs to which they are attached.

W. N. MAUL.

UNITED STATES SURVEYING SCHOONER "EWING,"
San Francisco, October 12, 1850.

SIR: You will proceed to Washington by the first opportunity, carrying with you the results of our labors for the past season.

Immediately on your arrival at Washington you will report to the superintendent of the United States Coast Survey, and lay before him our works and reports.

You will also inform the superintendent, in detail, the peculiar situation of the country, and the wants of the survey on this coast.

It only remains for me to thank you for the zealous assistance you have afforded me since your attachment to this vessel, and to wish a happy reunion with your family and friends.

I am, respectfully and truly, yours,

WM. P. McARTHUR,
Lieut. Comd'g and Assisstant U. S. Coast Survey.

W. A. BARTLETT, *Lieutenant.*

Reported, Willis Station, November 26th, 1850.

A. D. BACHE.

Letter from the Hon. John Y. Mason, ex-Secretary of the Navy, to Hon. James Guthrie, Secretary of the Treasury.

PARIS, *September* 2, 1854.

DEAR SIR: Lieutenant Bartlett, of the United States navy, is about leaving Paris, on his return to the United States. It gives me great pleasure to bear my testimony to the care and vigilance with which this gentleman has performed his responsible duties since I have been here, and to express my admiration of the splendid lights which have been manufactured under his supervision for the coasts of the United States.

I do not believe that there are in the world superior mechanical structures for the safety of commerce than those which have been prepared here under the superintendence of Mr. Bartlett. The chief credit is unquestionably due to the faithful and skillful manufacturers, but no small share is, in my judgement, due to Mr. Bartlett, who has displayed zeal, industry and intelligence in the performance of his duties. I hope that you will not consider me obtrusive in thus expressing my admiration of the lens lights prepared here for the exposed and dangerous coasts of my country.

I have the honor to be, most respectfully,

J. Y. MASON.

Hon. JAMES GUTHRIE,
Secretary of the Treasury, Washington.

H Street, Washington, D. C.,
January 16, 1856.

Sir: I acknowledge the receipt of your letter.

The board of which I was the senior officer, and of the action of which you complain, having some time since completed the duty assigned it, has been, as I suppose you know, dissolved by the authority by which it was appointed; and I am of the opinion that no individual of its late members is competent to speak for it in relation to the matters which came before it, or of the gounds on which any of its decisions were made.

No inference, either favorable or unfavorable, should be drawn from my conduct towards any person whose name may have been embraced in the report of the board, as to my individual opinion in relation to him, or as to my vote in his case; it has always been my endeavor to keep my social relations free from influence by anything of an unpleasant nature that may occur in the discharge of my official duties.

With due respect, I am, &c., &c.

W. B. SHUBRICK.

Washington A. Bartlett, Esq.

Testimonial of Commodore E. A. F. Lavallette on the services of Lieut. Bartlett in the Pacific Squadron.

Philadelphia, *January* 22, 1856.

Dear Sir: I have received your letter of the 22d instant, in which you state, that "while absent from the country, serving as first lieutenant of the flag-ship of the African squadron, it has pleased the late 'Navy Board' to present my name to the President to be stricken from the rolls as lieutenant in the navy.

"I have had the honor to serve under your command as a midshipman, and again as lieutenant, commanding the armed prize brig Argo in the Gulf of California, and in the attack on Guaymas, and its occupation. On that occasion you did me the honor to assign me to the most advanced post, on the night previous to the attack, out of supporting distance of the guns of the squadron, and out of sight, being covered by the island which separated me from the squadron.

"How did I bear myself on that occasion? Did I meet your expectations or not?

"From your knowledge of me, my abilities and acquirements, was or was I not an efficient officer of the Pacific squadron during the Mexican war?"

In answer, I have to state, that your foregoing statements of our operations in the Gulf of California are correct in every particular. Your conduct on that occasion not only met my approbation, but the activity, energy, and skill which you displayed in getting your gun landed, merited—and the effect which it produced, by your management, upon the works of the enemy entitled you to—the highest praise.

Your abilities and acquirements I consider quite equal to any of your grade, and very superior to very many of them. I certainly viewed you as an efficient officer of the Pacific squadron.

I am, respectfully, your obedient servant,

E. A. F. LAVALLETTE.

WASH'N A. BARTLETT, Esq.,
Late Lieut. U. S. Navy, Washington City, D. C.

Correspondence between the Committee and Mr. Bartlett during the investigation of his case.

DEXTER'S HOTEL, WASHINGTON,
March 7, 1856.

SIR: Having learned from your committee that you are to take into consideration my memorial to-morrow at 12 o'clock, I have to request that you will be pleased to summon before you the following named gentlemen, believing that their testimony may become necessary to a complete knowledge of facts, viz: Captain J. B. Montgomery, United States navy, corner I and 15th street, Washington; Professor A. D. Bache, Coast Survey; Hon. Albert Smith, Ebbett House; Lieutenant Richard Forrest, United States navy, Washington, and Henry B. Watson esq., late captain United States marine corps, North Carolina; should circumstances demand the presence of others, I shall name them to the honorable chairman of the committee.

Very respectfully, sir, your obedient servant,

WASHINGTON A. BARTLETT.

S. R. MALLORY, Esq.,
Chairman Naval Committee.

SENATE NAVAL COMMITTEE ROOM,
March 11, 1856.

SIR: I am instructed by the Naval Committee of the Senate, to whom was referred your memorial upon the subject of your dismissal frow the navy, to notify you that they have the same under consideration; that a member of the late Naval Board is now before them to disclose, upon oath, the reasons which induced the action of the board in your case, and a recommendation of your dismissal by a vote of 14 to 1, and to say to you that you may attend and participate in the examinations of the action of the board in your case at your pleasure.

C. W. DOWNING,
Clerk Committee Naval Affairs.

W. A. BARTLETT, Esq.

SENATE NAVAL COMMITTEE ROOM,
March 25, 1856.

SIR: I am instructed by the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs to inform you, that you are at liberty to examine the evidence before it in your case, in the investigation of which you personally participated to a considerable extent; and to produce each explanations touching the subject of their inquiries as to you may seem expedient.

Should you desire to examine any witnesses who are subject to the order of the Navy Department, the committee will cause them to attend for this purpose. Respectfully, &c.,

C. W. DOWNING,
Clerk Com. Naval Affairs of the Senate.

W. A. BARTLETT, Esq.

DEXTER'S HOTEL,
Washington, March 26, 1856.

SIR: I have this morning received the communication of yesterday's date made to me by Mr. C. W. Downing, clerk to the Committee of Naval Affairs of the Senate, in which it is stated that "I (he) am instructed by the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs to inform you, that you (I) are at liberty to examine the evidence before it in your (my) case, in the investigation of which you (I) personally participated to a considerable extent; and to produce such explanations touching the subject of their inquiries as to you (me) may seem expedient." And also should "you (I) desire to examine any witnesses who are subject to the order of the Navy Department the committee will cause them to attend for this purpose." And in reply, in order that I may meet the views of the committee, as above expressed, I have to request that your clerk may be directed to furnish me with a complete copy of all the testimony or documents in my case, in order that I may be able to furnish a list of the witnesses and obtain the documents requisite to present to the committee in the case.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

WASH'N A. BARTLETT.

Hon. S. R. MALLORY,
Chairman Naval Committee, Senate.

SENATE NAVAL COMMITTEE ROOM,
March 31, 1856.

SIR: In reply to your note of 26th instant, addressed to the chairman of this committee, I am instructed by the committee to inform you that the duties of clerk of the committee are such that he would not have time to furnish you with copies of the evidence taken in your case, but you are at liberty to copy it, or have it copied in the committee room, while the clerk is present.

Respectfully, &c.,

C. W. DOWNING,
Clerk Com. Naval Affairs of the Senate.

W. A. BARTLETT, Esq.

WASHINGTON, *April* 1, 1856.

SIR: The Naval Committee having permitted the testimony taken in my case to be furnished me, as I requested in my note of the 26th ultimo, I trust it will not be regarded as a fit subject for senatorial reference until I have had an opportunity to reply to it, as I pledged myself to do in my letter of the eleventh March last.

Your obedient servant,

WASHINGTON A. BARTLETT.

To the CHAIRMAN *of the Naval Committee, U. S. Senate.*

SENATE NAVAL COMMITTEE ROOM,
April 28, 1856.

SIR: I am instructed by the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate to inform you that the committee will be prepared to report upon your case on *Monday next*, and that any testimony you desire to produce before the committee must be presented on or before *Thursday* next.

Respectfully, your obedient servant,

C. W. DOWNING,
Clerk Committee Naval Affairs.

WASHINGTON, *April* 28, 1856.

SIR: I have just received a note of this date from the clerk of your committee, stating that he was instructed to inform me "that the committee would be prepared upon your (my) case on Monday next, and that any testimony you (I) desire to produce before the committee must be presented on or before Thursday next."

All the testimony taken before you, as I understand, was written down. After it had been concluded, on my application, you permitted the clerk to furnish me with a certified copy thereof; this was done on the 8th day of April. Since that period I have been busily engaged in collecting my evidence and preparing my reply. Considering the nature of the charges and the remoteness of the localities where the transactions occurred out of which some of the charges arise, the time which I have consumed is brief indeed. But by great industry I have the pleasure now to say that my reply is completed.

For the purpose of facilitating the examination by the committee of the numerous documents, &c., which make a part of it, I have placed the whole in the hands of the printer, and will be enabled to furnish it to the committee on an early day next week.

I trust therefore I will not be considered as asking from the committee too great a favor, in a matter where my personal character is to be vindicated, that they postpone the consideration of this matter until Thursday week.

With great respect, I have the honor to be your obedient servant,

WASHINGTON A. BARTLETT.

Hon. S. R. MALLORY,
Chairman Naval Committee, Senate.

WASHINGTON CITY, *May* 7, 1856.

SIR: I transmit herewith my answer to the charges and testimony before your committee, on the subject of my memorial.

I trust that it will be found to be conclusive; but should there remain any doubt upon the mind of the committee, I stand prepared, whenever or wherever opportunity shall be afforded—under those safe-guards which the law of the land has prescribed for the protection of the innocent—to "make good my defence."

In case this course should be authorized and required, I beg leave to append a list of my witnesses.

I am, respectfully, &c.,

WASH'N A. BARTLETT.

Hon. STEPHEN R. MALLORY,
Chairman of the Naval Committee of the Senate.

For list of witnesses see pages 51 and 52 of printed document transmitted herewith. W. A. B.

SENATE NAVAL COMMITTEE ROOM, *May* 9, 1856.

SIR: In reply to your letter of 7th instant, I am instructed by the Committee of Naval Affairs to say, that the committee will confine its report to the facts (and their opinion thereon) involved in the three following transactions:

1st. The sale of a shawl at Monterey in 1846.

2nd. Your conduct in the discharge of your duties as caterer of the ward-room mess in the Portsmouth.

3rd. The introduction of certain goods at San Francisco, while you were in command of the Ewing.

If you wish to present before the committee witnesses to be examined respecting these facts, it will be glad to defer the report on your memorial for that purpose for a reasonable time; and if any of them be within reach of orders from the Navy Department, they will be given on your application.

Respectfully, your obedient servant,

C. W. DOWNING,
Clerk Committee of Naval Affairs.

WASHINGTON, *May* 10, 1856.

SIR: I have to acknowledge the receipt of a letter from the clerk of your committee, dated on yesterday, informing me that your committee "will confine its report to the facts (and their opinion thereon) involved in the three following transactions:

"1st. The sale of a shawl at Monterey in 1846.

"2d. Your conduct in the discharge of your duties as caterer of the ward-room mess of the Portsmouth.

"3d. The introduction of certain goods into San Francisco while you were in the command of the Ewing."

I have already had the honor of exhibiting my explanations, and such proofs as were within my reach at the time, of the entire falsity not only of these allegations, but also of those which charged me with "*speculating on a private library, and meanly soliciting subscriptions from individuals, some of whom it was well known would not continue in the ship longer than her outward passage, and among whom was a public functionary,*" and with *presenting an account to the Treasury Department for my expenses while at Paris, which were not admitted until altered, and which contained charges for items deemed discreditable to me as an officer.*

As these two last charges are not included in the present notification, I conclude that the committee are already entirely convinced of their entire falsity, and will do me the justice *so to declare when the proper time arrives.*

In reference to the items contained in the present notification, I have no further explanation to make. The witnesses within my reach I have appealed to, and copies of their statements and letters in reference to the second and third specifications are before you. I am ready to produce the originals and verify them. If the committee would send subpœnas to these witnesses, I feel very confident they would attend, or if they consider they have not the power to use this means, which is ordinarily regarded as necessary to the investigation of such a subject, an informal invitation on the part of the committee would probably secure this end. I shall myself address these gentlemen, and use my influence to procure their attendance at as early a day as possible. The gentlemen referred to are Captain J. B. Montgomery, United States Navy, Washington; Henry B. Watson, esq., late captain United States marine corps, Aline Park, near Smithfield, Johnston county, North Carolina; Joseph W. Revere, esq., late lieutenant United States navy, Morristown, New Jersey; James W. Bingham, 88 Wall street, New York; E. H. Harrison, esq., Girard House, Philadelphia; Professor A. D. Bache, Washington; Captain A. V. Fraser, United States revenue service, Treasury Department; A. C. Rhind, late lieutenant United States navy, Stapleton, Staten Island, New York; Executive Officer Ewing; Commodore T. Ap Catesby Jones, Washington; Cadwalader Ringgold, commander, United States navy, Washington. The gentlemen now in Washington will appear whenever notified, and as soon as others may arrive I will notify the committee thereof.

In reference to the first item, as to the sale of the shawl, the only witness that could be produced is the lady referred to in my printed "reply," who is now at San Francisco.

As to the third item, I am somewhat at a loss, as the inquiry is stated to refer "to the *introduction* of certain goods at San Francisco, while in command of the Ewing." In my reply I have admitted that I did introduce goods as is here stated. I presume, however, from the evidence, that something more than this is intended by the com-

mittee, for they surely cannot intend to investigate the mere fact of introducing goods. I understood the charge to be distinctly made that I smuggled those goods and used the Ewing to convey them. This I have pronounced false, and the witnesses already referred to have so declared it, and will so restate it when called before you.

I am, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WASH'N H. BARTLETT.

Hon. S. R. MALLORY,
Chairman Naval Committee, United States Senate.

SENATE NAVAL COMMITTEE ROOM, *May* 12, 1856.

Sir: In reply to your letter of 10th instant, (which was received by the chairman of the committee to-day,) I am directed by the committee to say, that they desire to be informed, for the purpose of avoiding unnecessary delay, as to which of the three transactions, specially referred to in their letter to you of 9th instant, each of the witnesses named in your letter of the 10th instant (and received to-day) is expected to testify.

Respectfully,

C. W. DOWNING,
Clerk Committee of Naval Affairs, Senate.

WASH'N A. BARTLETT, Esq.

DEXTER'S HOTEL, WASHINGTON, *May* 12, 1856.

SIR: The letter of your committee of this day has just been received, desiring "to be informed, for the purpose of avoiding unnecessary delay, as to which of the three transactions, specially refered to in (your) their letter to you (me) of the 9th instant, each of the witnesses named in your (my) letter of the 10th instant (and received to-day) is expected to testify."

In my letter of the 10th instant, I gave to the committee the names of the witnesses who were "within my reach," and whose testimony, in my judgment, would be sufficient to satisfy them as to the second and third specifications in their letter of the 9th, and who would probably appear if summoned or invited by you. I did not arrange the witnesses under the two heads or specifications, *as nearly all of them* were refered to, *in my printed letter, in connexion with the specific facts.* I lose no time, however, in complying with your request of this morning.

On the second specification—Henry B. Watson, esq.; Joseph W. Revere, esq.; Captain J. B. Montgomery, U. S. N.

On the third specification—E. H. Harrison, esq.; James W. Bingham, esq.; A. V. Frazier, esq., captain revenue service; A. C. Rhind, esq.; Prof. A. D. Bache; Commodore Thos. Ap Catesby Jones; Commodore Cadwallader Ringgold, U. S. navy.

As already stated in reference to the first specification, the only person who could explain the transaction as to the falsely alleged sale of the shawl, is a lady who was present at the time of the transaction, whose name I have not heretofore mentioned, Mrs. Thos. O. Larkin, of Monterey, or San Francisco.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

WASH'N A. BARTLETT.

Hon. S. R. MALLORY,
Chairman Naval Committee, Senate.

DEXTER'S HOTEL, WASHINGTON, *May* 13, 1856.

DEAR SIR: Should there be any communication for me from the Naval Committee to-day, *to-morrow*, or *next day*, you will please address me care of *Hon. P. Phillips, Washington*, as I am compelled to be out of the city *Wednesday* and *Thursday*, but shall be present on *Friday morning.*

You will please mark on the cover of any such communication, "*from Naval Committee.*"

Yours, very truly,

W. H. BARTLETT.

C. W. DOWNING, Esq., *Clerk Naval Committee, Senate.*

SENATE NAVAL COMMITTEE ROOM, *May* 16, 1856.

SIR: The meeting of the committee in your case has been postposed until Monday next, (19th instant,) at 10 o'clock, a. m., (in consequence of your absence from the city,) at which time you may attend, if you think proper.

The gentlemen mentioned in your last letter to the committee are expected to be present as witnesses.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

C. W. DOWNING,
Clerk Committee on Naval Affairs.

WASHINGTON A. BARTLETT, Esq.

WASHINGTON, *May* 20, 1856.

SIR: On the 18th instant I had the honor of enclosing to your committee copies of interrogatories to be propounded to Professor A. D. Bache, Commodore Ap Catesby Jones, Captain J. B. Montgomery, Commander Ringgold, Henry B. Watson, late captain United States marine corps, Joseph W. Revere, late lieutenant United States navy, A. C. Rhind, late lieutenant United States navy, Captain A. V. Frazer, United States revenue service, with the request "*that each may*

be distinctly propounded to each one, and the answer written down in the precise language of the witness." I delivered these papers in person to the committee, at its session on yesterday, and then understood you to say that you regarded many or most of these interrogatories as irrelevant, and that the committee would only ask such questions as they thought relevant. The interrogatories may not have been drawn with great legal precision; but as they were very limited in number, and mere irrelevancy could injure no one, I had hoped that in so serious a matter as this my suggestions and wishes would have been complied with. However, while the committee take such course as they think proper, I will continue to act in the line which my sense of justice dictates, and, therefore, I now enclose you two other lists of interrogatories for E. H. Harrison and James W. Bingham, with a respectful repetition of my request, "that each may be distinctly propounded, and the answer to each one written down in the precise language of the witness." When the absent witnesses arrive, I will notify you of the fact. Your clerk informs me that Mr. Harrison is sick, and I would therefore suggest that the interrogatories be forwarded to him with the permission that his answers may be made before any one authorized to administer an oath.

I am, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WASH'N A. BARTLETT.

Hon. S. R. MALLORY,
Chairman Naval Committee, United States Senate.

DEXTER'S HOTEL, *Washington, May* 20, *P. M.*

SIR: In compliance with my promise, to inform the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate of the arrival of any of the witnesses named in the list presented by me to the committee, I have to state that Mr. James W. Bingham has arrived this evening, and, as his engagements are pressing, to hope that the committee will give him an examination to-morrow. He will be at the committee room from 10 o'clock.

Very respectfully, sir, your obedient servant,

WASH'N A. BARTLETT.

Hon. S. R. MALLORY,
Chairman Naval Committee, Senate.

WASHINGTON, *May* 24, 1856.

SIR: It having been intimated to me that the Committee on Naval Affairs is inclined to the opinion, that I intended, by the statement in my printed letter, that on the arrival of the seamen's clothing at San Francisco "they were regularly passed through the custom-house," to convey the impression the duty had been paid, or if the

committee had not derived that impression from the said statement, that the collector had been induced to pass the clothing duty free, from my misrepresentation of the use and purpose for which it was intended. If such an impression exists, it is wholly erroneous, as will be seen by a particular reference to that letter.

The charge of Mr. Missroon was, "that it was known to one or more members of the Naval Board that his, Bartlett's, conduct on board the surveying schooner Ewing was discreditable to him, and believed to be dishonest."

This charge, as aided by the implication of the other testimony in the case, is composed of two elements:

1. That I had used the Ewing to convey the clothing.
2. That the clothing had been smuggled into the port.

The first charge is disproved by the receipt for the freight to the ship John G. Costar, and the testimony of Mr. Bingham. The second charge is disproved by the testimony of Bingham, and the statement of the collector, and the negative evidence of other witnesses.

While the charge of smuggling, which I understand to be a "secret" or "clandestine" introduction of goods into a country, has always been peremptorily denied, there has never been any denial that the duties were not paid. I knew just as well what Mr. Bingham, who was the head of the house at San Francisco in which I was interested, would state, at the time I requested you to examine him, as I know now. At page 23 I gave this history of the transaction:

"While at Valparaiso I purchased from the United States naval agency $728 25 worth of British sample clothing, (seamen's, and especially suited for surveying service,) equal to only one suit per man; my object in doing so was to have the means within my control of supplying the crew with clothing suitable to their work at a low price. We had learned that clothing had, with everything else, reached fabulous prices at San Francisco. The men's wages were but $12 to $18 per month, while the wages of the port were $250 to $300. These goods were shipped on board the John G. Costar and not on board the Ewing. The freight-bill and receipt are now in my possession, and a copy thereof will be found in the Appendix, IV. When they arrived at San Francisco, they were regularly passed through the custom-house, as will appear by the following affidavits."

I did not consider that I was answering to the question, whether the collector, under the circumstances, seeing that the clothing was purchased for the use and benefit of the crew of the Ewing, was wrong or right in passing the clothing without duty, but whether I had smuggled them. The statement of the collector is: "the undersigned does not see in this transaction alluded to anything to implicate Mr. Bartlett, or to attach to him a charge of smuggling. It is evident he applied to the proper authority to have the articles landed and placed under his control; and the question of duties or no duties was, under the circumstances of the customs in California, a question the undersigned could fully decide for himself and the *public service;* and that the undersigned did decide the matter in such manner as the circumstances called for there can be no doubt."

After the clothing thus passed through the custom-house and

landed, Lieutenant McArthur took as much of it for the crew as they wanted at that time, to wit: the amount of $239 50, as will be seen by reference to the disbursing office of the Coast Survey.

The balance was left on my hands very unexpectedly, and sold for a sum which did not reimburse me for my outlay. The clothing was sold by the firm of Bingham, Reynolds, Bartlett & Co., and the proceeds paid to me, after deducting commissions and other expenses. If this had been a trading transaction, the proceeds would have gone to the credit of the firm, and would not have appeared as a personal credit to me.—(See Bingham's affidavit, p. 23.)

It will thus be perceived that my purchase of the clothing was not made for the purpose of trade or gain, but for the accommodation of the crew; that upon this consideration they were regularly admitted and passed through the custom-house duty free. It may be said this was a violation of the law. It may be so, but custom of a very general character has permitted to collectors the exercise of a discretion in particular cases. Scarcely a vessel returns to our ports from a foreign cruise in which articles, often of considerable value, intended not for the purpose of trade, but for the use of the officers and as presents for friends, are not entered free of duty. There may be no law for this, but such is the practice, and though well known it has not been arrested by the government. I submit that the circumstances of this case might well justify the collector in not exacting the duty, and if there has not been a very exact discharge of his duties under the revenue law of the United States, it will be remembered that this transaction took place before California was admitted into the Union, and before our revenue laws had been formally put in operation in the country, and while the collector was discharging his functions under a mere military appointment. It will also be remembered that during this period, to wit, from the conquest of California to the 13th of November 1849, when James Collier, esq., the first collector appointed under constitutional provision, arrived at San Francisco, it was a matter of grave doubt whether, under the mere military authority of the officers of the army and navy, any duties were at all collectable. At the December term, 1853, the Supreme Court of the United States, after a very able discussion, decided this case in favor of the duties. In the introductory part of the decision the court say: "it seems, from the institution of the suit until now, to have been conducted with the wish on the part of the United States to give to the plaintiffs every opportunity to establish their claim judicially if that could be done, and with a desire on its part to obtain from this court a decision as to what are the rights of the United States in respect to tonnage and import duties in such a conjuncture as that was, when California was ceded by treaty to the United States, before Congress had authorized such duties to be collected there by a special act."

My object, however, is merely to affirm that *I have never intended to say*, and *have never said*, that duties were paid on this clothing; on the contrary, I always contended that the collector was justified in not collecting the duties, for the reasons assigned. Mr. Simms, one of the witnesses called against me, states: "*Bartlett said he had*

seen Harrison, amd had told him the goods were for the use of the vessel, and Harrison had charged nothing for them.''

This has been my statement from the beginning to the end.

I am, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

WASH'N A. BARTLETT.

Hon. S. R. MALLORY,
Chairman Committee Naval Affairs, United States Senate.

SENATE NAVAL COMMITTEE ROOM,
June 2, 1856.

SIR: I am instructed by the committee to inform you, that if you will make out your account as a witness to attend said committee, and give your evidence in the case of Mr. Washington A. Bartlett, (pending in said committee,) at two dollars per day from the time you attended, and ten cents per mile going and coming from the place of your residence at the time you were requested to attend, receipt the same and send it to me, it will be paid.

Respectfully, your obedient servant,

C. W. DOWNING,
Clerk Com. Naval Affairs of Senate U. S.

JAMES W. BINGHAM, Esq.,
88 *Wall street, New York.*

NOTE.—Similar letters addressed to A. C. Rhind, esq., and Lieutenant H. Davidson, who was summoned as a witness, but not examined.

A.

UNITED STATES SURVEYING SCHOONER EWING,
Off Benicia, California, March 12, 1850.

SIR: We desire respectfully to represent to you the following circumstances, and to appeal to the department on a point of duty:

There were ordered to this vessel when she was fitted out at New York, in December 1848, a commanding and one other lieutenant, officers of the grade of passed midshipmen, making up her complement. The Ewing was brought to San Francisco under the command of the lieutenant second in rank, the commanding officer to whom we reported joining her soon after her arrival, having come hither via Panama. Lieutenant Washington Allon Bartlett still remained attached to her when the command reverted to Lieutenant William P. McArthur, but was permitted to go on shore; and he took up his residence with a mercantile firm, as a partner, in which his name had appeared in the public prints of New York before our sailing from

that port. Since that permission to leave the vessel was granted to Lieutenant Bartlett he has performed no actual duty, though he has occasionally appeared on board, recognized as one of her officers. The watches have been kept by the passed midshipmen, the executive duties being attended to, in addition, by the senior passed midshipmen, acting master.

The duty, which the temptations of the country upon the fidelity of the crew oblige us to perform, has sometimes been arduous, always harassing. We cannot but think it partial and unjust that all the duty should be exacted from the junior officers, and none at all from an officer attached to the vessel by order of the honorable Secretary of the Navy, as we are, and whose rank in the service, superior to ours, is yet that of a watch officer. Recently, on our arrival at this port, we were informed by Lieutenant Commanding William P. McArthur that he would order Lieutenant Bartlett on board to keep a watch, the duty being, and having been for a time, somewhat severer than usual. Subsequently he refused to do so, saying that he had a delicacy about it, when spoken to by Passed Midshipman Gibson. Lieutenant Bartlett came on board, however, we believe, by order, and kept one or two watches. We are now given to understand that it was done *merely as an act of favor*, it being expressly denied that we had any right to expect it in point of duty. To you, sir, is the question respectfully submitted.

It seems to us strange that an officer can nominally belong to a particular vessel, yet, on board of that vessel, stand in no official position, and have no specific official functions. It seems to us strange and anomalous that an officer of the navy can receive credit for sea service and be living on shore, an avowed member of a business copartnership, at one and the same time. It seems to us stranger than all, that the enjoyment of the golden realities and speculations of California by our superiors, and the debarring of them from those whom we are placed over by law, making morbid undisciplined imaginations, should (two so very different things) operate jointly to make our service more arduous, that it would be an indelicacy to require those who enjoy all the privileges to share the duty.

We have the honor to be, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servants,

C. C. SIMMS,
WM. GIBSON.

Hon. Wm. B. Preston.

B.

United States Ship Portsmouth, *October* 8, 1846.

When you ceased to be caterer of this mess at Monterey, and rendered an account of your office, we became convinced that you had not only betrayed the trust reposed in you by your messmates by the most culpable negligence, but likewise in a manner far more serious, to

which we only now allude. For this, and for a number of other acts of yours while on board this ship, we have long ceased to feel for you the feelings of an equal, and have wished no longer to know you, and now that you have left the ship and ceased to be a member of our mess, we take this manner of intimating to you that we wish hereafter to meet you as a stranger.

J. S. MISSROON,
JAS. H. WATMOUGH,
BEN. F. B. HUNTER,
A. A. HENDERSON, *Assistant Surgeon*,
M. DUVALL,
N. B. HARRISON, *Acting Master*.

W. A. BARTLETT, *Lieutenant*.

OFFICE IN YERBA BUENA, *October* 15, 1846.

SIR: I am under the necessity of addressing you concerning a note which I have received, signed by Lieutenant Missroon and five other officers of the ward-room mess of the ship, charging me with "culpable negligence in managing the affairs of the mess, and also of betraying the trust reposed in me in a far more serious manner," "and that for this and a number of other acts while on board the ship they desire hereafter to consider me a stranger."

Charges like the above, sir, cannot be by me received without meeting them, let the consequence be what it may. I meet them with the most positive denial of any foundation in fact, and demand that they be proved or withdrawn.

I place myself on the ground of my entire innocence of any such intent or act, as implied in the charge, and upon that ground I will stand or fall. What the "other acts" referred to are, I know not; but I feel confident in asserting that any "act" of mine, either public or private, can be explained to any unprejudiced mind in such a manner as to acquit me from any serious offence against the laws of the navy, or propriety of conduct required of me as an officer and gentleman.

I submit to you, sir, the case, and desire that you call upon them to show why they have taken this course, when there are methods of proceeding so different, and which would give me a fair chance of confronting them, which cannot be expected without others to decide between us.

I shall await patiently the time when I can meet these charges on fair terms, either before yourself, or any court of inquiry or court martial, which may be required to bring out the truth and this matter to a final issue; that issue I have no desire to avoid, and the only reason that I did not lay it before you the moment I received the note was because the exigencies of the service, as you are well aware, required that there should be no interruption to the preparations for the hurried departure of the forces. Relying on the ground of my entire innocence and the power of truth, I await the result with all

possible calmness, and the continued desire to merit your approbation in the discharge of all my duties.

Very respectfully, sir, I have the honor to be your obedient servant,

WASH'N A. BARTLETT,
Lieutenant United States navy.

Commander JOHN B. MONTGOMERY, *U. S. N.*,
Commanding northern district of California.

UNITED STATES SHIP PORTSMOUTH,
Yerba Buena, October 16, 1846.

SIR: Mr. Bartlett, in his letter to you of yesterday, apprising you of the determination which the ward-room mess has arrived at in his case, has been pleased to place me in a conspicuous position, by the sole mention of my name; this, and his tone of defiance, make me feel myself called upon to meet a certain part of that letter in a manner more direct than otherwise I should have been disposed to do.

Mr. Bartlett says, "I feel confident in asserting that any 'act' of mine, either public or private, can be explained to any unprejudiced mind in such a manner as to acquit me from any serious offence against the laws of the navy, or propriety of conduct required of me as an officer and gentleman," and "I shall await patiently the time when I can meet these charges on fair terms, either before yourself or any court of inquiry or court martial, which may be required to bring out the truth," &c.

In the first place, sir, I desire it to be understood, that as the executive officer of this ship, I have, more than once, seriously thought of preferring charges against Lieutenant Bartlett; but have, in each instance, been deterred, *solely* by the entire prostration of the man, when spoken to by me officially of his acts, which were at variance with the usages of the service, and with the deportment of an officer and gentleman. This feeling of compassion is now, however, removed, by the assurances which he gives you of the uniform propriety of his conduct, challenging investigation.

I beg leave, therefore, to inform you, sir, of my immediate readiness to submit charges against Lieutenant Bartlett, for unofficer-like conduct, in bringing to sea a stock of clothing, cloths, cigars, &c., which were vended to his brother officers and others, making his state room a kind of huckster's shop, and degrading thereby the respectability of the ward-room; in speculating upon a private library, and meanly soliciting subscriptions of money from individuals, some of whom, it was well known, would not continue in the ship longer than her outward passage, and among whom was a public functionary; in disposing of, at *private and secret* sale to a lady at Monterey, an article of dress, at an exorbitant advance upon its cost, and when detected and exposed in it withdrawing the article—thus showing his consciousness of the impropriety—all of which, whenever required, shall appear in specific form. My information on the foregoing points was

mainly derived from the ward-room officers, enough of whom are now in the squadron to substantiate the charges.

If it be deemed proper to go further back than this cruise, or should Mr. Bartlett desire to do so, in order to establish the point of "that propriety of conduct required of me as an officer and gentleman," there will be no difficulty in adducing instances upon the testimony of respectable officers, (I name Passed Midshipmen Morris and Duer,) which occurred in the surveying service, and which places Mr. Bartlett in a worse light than anything charged against him in this letter; a statement of which you are at liberty to call on me for.

Lieut. W. Schenck, who is expected here in February, is an important witness, now that Lieutenant Forrest has returned to the United States. With a desire to act openly in the matter, I would respectfully request that Mr. Bartlett may be made aware of all I communicate to you on this subject; and I beg leave to suggest, that if you determine to recommend a court, or if Mr. Bartlett still desires to have one, it be assembled before the witnesses now in the squadron return to the United States, among whom are Dr. Chase. Mr. Carter, and W. Schenck.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

J. S. MISSROON,

First Lieutenant United States Ship Portsmouth.

To Commander J. B. MONTGOMERY,

United States Ship Portsmouth.

UNITED STATES SHIP PORTSMOUTH,

Yerba Buena, October 16, 1846.

SIR: We have perused the letter of Lieutenant Bartlett handed by you to the executive officer last evening, which complains of the grounds upon which we have thought it necessary and proper to desire him to discontinue his acquaintance with us in future.

In addressing you this letter we beg leave to assure you, sir, that we do not feel ourselves bound to answer any demand coming from Lieutenant Bartlett; we write only for your information.

The palpable mal-administration of our mess affairs induced the mess to deprive him of the office of caterer. Suspicions of his dishonesty in the disposal of funds entrusted to him were strengthened by his delay and evident reluctance in yielding up the mess accounts to his successors; but these mere suspicions became confirmed when, in course of examination, it appeared that he had charged more than was proved to have been the actual daily expenses in several instances, and which, when so proved, he in subsequent accounts altered the items to suit the evidence adduced against his previous statement. The balancing of his accounts was made by a convenient and repeated insertion of "sundries," of which he could give no satisfactory information.

At this period it was contemplated to signify to Mr. Bartlett that he could no longer be associated with as a messmate, but his pitiably

depressed deportment, and meek submission to the cool reserve with which he was generally treated, moved our compassion, while it convinced us of his conscious guilt. When, however, he considered himself as withdrawn from the mess by his engagements on shore, we were unwilling to be longer recognized by him as acquaintances, and therefore it was that we addressed him our note.

"Other acts" to which we had reference, and of which Mr. Bartlett most strangely professes himself to be ignorant, scarcely require recapitulation here; those committed previous to, as well as during, the present cruise, have certainly given him a most unenviable reputation and notoriety in the navy; so much so, indeed, that no less than two officers of standing, now in this squadron, have objected to orders to this ship, because they would necessarily by them be associated with Mr. Bartlett, alleging his character as the ground of objection. But, sir, in order to avoid a charge of vague generalities in a matter so serious, we will cite an instance of disreputable conduct of comparatively recent occurrence, which has had great weight with us in the course we have taken. At Monterey, in May last, he disgraced himself as an officer, and reflected discredit upon his ship, by smuggling and disposing of an article of dress to a lady, at an exorbitant advance upon its cost, evincing at the same time his own sense of the impropriety of the transaction, by asking a promise of secresy, and by subsequent shameful equivocation when questioned on the subject.

We are surprised at his assumed defiance and reckless denial of facts which are so susceptible of the fullest proof, and in order that Mr. Bartlett may comprehend his position, we respectfully request that he may see this letter.

We have the honor to be your obedient servants,

J. S. MISSROON, *Lieutenant;*
BEN. T. B. HUNTER, *Acting Lieutenant;*
JAS. H. WATMOUGH,
A. A. HENDERSON, *Assistant Surgeon;*
N. B. HARRISON, *Acting Master.*

ALCALDE'S OFFICE, YERBA BUENA, *November* 14, 1846.

SIR: Enclosed you will receive the letters to which you referred in your letter to me of this date. I trust that through a kind Providence the time will come when the poison shall be extricated from them, and my mind relieved from the load with which they have oppressed me. As, sir, you did not ask me to make any explanations upon them, I shall not offer any, except to say, that my anxious efforts to serve my messmates faithfully, and in all things to the best of my ability, have been most sorely requited; while acts of kindness and repeated solicitation to part with some articles I could spare (although always unwilling) have been represented in a light far different from that in which they were received when it was considered that a favor had been conferred; and others are stated or rumored that have no foundation in fact. Upon such charges it seems useless to attempt by ex-

planation to disabuse the minds of those who state that they have so deliberately concluded; therefore I cannot hope that aught I could say would make any favorable impression upon them; hence I only say or write thus much, and to you, sir, only.

Trusting that to my esteemed commander, who has so long known me, I shall be yet able to make good my defence and prove ever worthy of his confidence,

I have the honor to be, sir, with high respect, your obedient humble servant,

WASH. A. BARTLETT.

Commander JOHN B. MONTGOMERY,
Com'g northern district of California, and U. S. S. Portsmouth.

C.

Received from the Purser:

Dr. Wood	$20 00
Purser	200 00
Dr. Duval	43 00
Purser	20 00
Purser	100 00
Purser	53 00
Purser	22 00
	458 00
Stopp	90 50
Poultry	40 00
Sirius	18 25
Green	50 00
Green	44 62
Flour	10 00
Chickens	2 50
Corned beef and oysters	4 50
Thirteen days' marketing and sundries	80 06
Vegetables	10 00
Lard	6 50
Vermicelli	6 75
Sundries	7 75
Marketing	8 00
Butter	6 50
Missroon	5 12
Marketing	7 25
Marketing	1 50
Rice and bread	9 75
Marketing	5 25
	421 60
	420 80

Fifteen days' marketing	$64 06
Poultry and sugar, (Stopp's bill)	90 50
Squashes and vegetables, (Stopp)	10 00
Bill of brig Sirius	18 25
Lard, 26 lbs., at 25 cents	6 50
Vermicelli, 25 lbs., at 25 cents	6 25
Tin box	50
Porterage	1 00
Mustard, oranges	3 25
Tomatoes, onions	3 50
Baking-dishes, plates	2 00
Sugar	3 75
Chickens	2 50
Flour	10 00
Corned beef	3 25
	226 29
Oysters	1 25
Black pepper	75
Washing	2 00
Twelve turkeys	20 00
Twenty-four ducks, at $10	20 00
Chinese screens	4 00
	274 29
Received	2 50
	276 79
Marketing	8 75
Sundries	8 00
Flour	14 00
Pitcher	4 00
	34 75
	421 60
	456 35

D.

MESSMATES: Learning from Messrs. Missroon and Watson that there is dissatisfaction expressed with my late catership, and especially with regard to the amount of money charged by me as expended for marketing at Mazatlan, I desire your calm consideration of the following explanations, in order that I may be able to satisfy *all*, since the present state of my mind under the implied errors in my accounts is too painful to be borne. I cannot but believe that every one of my messmates is entirely unwilling to do me the least injustice; therefore I hold myself ready to make all the explanation my accounts or memory can give; but I wish the case fairly stated.

My accounts show as follows for marketing at Mazatlan:

March 18th, $4; 19th, $6 - - - -	$10 00
March 20th, $4; 21st, $4; 22d, $5 - - -	13 00
March 23d, $5; 24th, $4; 25th, $4 - - -	13 00
March 26th, $3; 27th, $3; 28th, $4; 29th, $4 -	14 00
March 30th, $4; 31st, $4; April 1st, $5 - -	13 00
	63 00
Add for purchased at the grocery: pepper, 25; vermicelli, 25; sage, 6¼; vegetables, 50 - -	1 06
March 18th to April 1st, both included, is 15 days -	64 06
	$4 27 daily.

With regard to the above, most of it was spent by Neal, who was market boy, and who Dr. Wood said knew all the prices and best places; besides, I frequently called him to my room, and took a note of every item, to see that he accounted for all the money given him. Neal will also recollect that we bought all the *tongues* that could be had, at 25 cents each, and put them in pickle—some days two, some three, some *four*. In consequence of the steward getting in the brig, we lost nearly all of them, as they spoiled. In consequence of having more company than usual, we some days sent twice to market; Neal will recollect it, I am certain. Again, I some days got fruit, oil, &c., which is included in the marketing, (being taken from my daily notes.) When I took money out of the mess-bag, it was charged as expended; if any was returned, it went the next day, or was spent during the day for some necessary article.

NOTE.—Mr. Watson obtained the idea that there had been $80 and over expended at market in 13 days; *it is not so charged in my book.* That amount would include—

Sundries - - - - - - -	$17 06
Marketing - - - - - - -	63 00
Equal to - - - - - - -	$80 06

But this was made up in amount as above; the real *marketing* is as stated on first page. W. A. BARTLETT.

There being several ships in the harbor, the mess had more or less company at dinner every day, and provision was made accordingly.
W. A. B.

I purchased stores as fast as possible; indeed, I seemed to have no time, for when I took the catership, the succeeding Wednesday was fixed upon as our day of sailing, as supposed for the Columbia river. Of salt provisions we had but a small quantity, and it was absolutely necessary they should be supplied with such articles as could be had, to supply the table on the passage.

I therefore ordered the poultry found charged in Stopp's bill, and he furnished the sugar at 50 cents the arroba less than any one else would sell it for, while he asked no more for his poultry, as I found by walking over the whole town.

His bill of poultry, sugar, and corn is - - -	$90 50
(having deducted the sack of sugar which I let the captain have.)	
I afterwards purchased of him—	
Squashes and vegetables - - - - -	10 00
Bill of brig Sirius - - - - - -	18 25
26 lbs. of lard, (25 cents per lb.) - - - -	6 50
25 lbs. of vermicelli, (25 cents per lb.) - - -	6 25
Tin box for same - - - - - -	50
Portcrage, (having two men going with me for three hours)	1 00
Mustard, 75 cents; oranges, $2 50 - - -	3 25
Tomatos, $2 00; onions, $1 50 - - - -	3 50
Baking dishes, $1 75; plates, $1 25 - - -	3 00
25 lbs. of sugar, (purchased on the second day of my catership, to save the white box then on hand) - -	3 75
Four chickens, (62½ cents each) - - - -	2 50
Flour, (one sack) - - - - - -	10 00
Paid a bill for corned beef, forgotten by N. Wood -	3 25
Of Williams, fresh oysters - - - -	1 25
1 lb. black pepper - - - - -	75
Washing table cloths, (eight) - - -	2 00
12 turkeys - - - - - -	20 00
24 ducks, ($10 per dozen) - - - -	20 00
Rice of Hanson, supplied by purser's steward - -	2 50
Paid for Chinese screens - - - - -	4 00
(I did not intend to buy but one, but the second being sent to exchange, it became injured, and I then paid for it.)	
	212 75
Add marketing, (sheet 1) - - - -	64 06
Total amount expended at Mazatlan - - -	276 81

W. A. BARTLETT.

Received of purser - - - - -	$200 00
Dr. Duvall - - - - - -	43 00
Purser - - - - - - -	20 00
	263 00
Dr. Wood - - - - - -	20 00
	283 00
	276 81
	6 19

on hand when I left Mazatlan; beside the $2 25 paid in by the old members to settle the cook's balance.

Mess expenses at Monterey.

22d to 28th, both included, I expended, in cash, for eggs, milk, vegetables, and butter	$8 00
Thirteen lbs. of butter, of Mr. Little	6 50
Cash sent on shore, by Mr. Misroon, 5 days	5 12½
The 4th, 5th, and 6th	3 75
The 7th, 8th, 9th, and 10th	3 50
The 11th and 12th	1 50
The 13th, 14th, and 15th	2 25
The 16th, 17th, and 18th	3 00
The 19th, 20th, 21st, and 22d	4 25
The 23d, 24th, 25th, and 26th	4 50
The 27th, 28th, and 29th	3 25
Four lbs. butter, of Mr. Little	2 00
Fish of the Kanakas	1 00
One barrel of flour, (Barnstable)	14 00
Two pitchers, (Barnstable)	4 00
Mr. Green's bill	56 00
Mr. Green's bill, (sea stores)	44 62
	167 24½
Add cash paid purser's steward for rice	4 75
Bread and rice, paid for by steward	5 00
	176 99
Washing table cloths	1 75
	178 74
	276 81
	455 55
Receipts at Mazatlan	283 00
At Monterey	175 00
	458 00
	455 55
	2 45
Paid Mr. Watson	2 50

W. A. BARTLETT.

E.

NEW YORK, *November* 7, 1844.

Lieut. WASHINGTON A. BARTLETT.

Bought of Harper and Brothers:

W. A. B.—*Catalogue of the Irving Library:*

1 Prescott's Conquest of Mexico, 3 vols	$6 00
1 Grattan's Netherlands	60
1 Rollin's Ancient History, 2 vols	3 75
1 Hallam's Middle Ages	2 00
1 Milman's History of Christianity, (Captain)	1 90
1 Scott's Scotland, 2 vols	1 20
1 Robertson's Charles V	1 75
1 Days of Queen Mary	20
1 Lady Sale's Journal	10
1 Goldsmith's Greece	38

1	Moors of Spain	$0 38
1	Xenophon, 2 vols	85
1	Lucien Bonaparte	30
1	Memoirs of H. More, 2 vols	1 50
1	Duchess d'Abrantès	1 37
1	Lives of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence	90
1	McGuire's Washington	1 13
1	Edmund Kean	65
1	Life of Haynes	90
1	Memoir of Hewes	62
1	Colonel Crockett	50
1	Necromancers	65
1	Anecdotes of Scott, (Sir Walter)	60
1	Apostles	25
1	Durbin's Travels	2 00
1	Santa Fé Expedition, (Mr. Smith)	2 50
1	Olin's Travels	2 50
1	Yucatan	5 00
1	Central America, (Mr. Smith)	5 00
1	Travels in Egypt	1 75
1	Glory and Shame	1 50
1	The Far West	1 50
1	Nestorians	1 00
1	A Year in Spain	2 25
1	Spain Revisited	1 75
1	American in England	1 50
1	Morrell's Voyages	1 50
1	Polynesian Researches	2 50
12	Before the Mast, at 45 cents	5 40
1	Owen's Voyages	1 13
1	Malan's Inquiry	20
1	Summerfield's Sermons, (Captain)	1 75
1	Renwick's Chemistry	75
1	Pleasures of Science	38
1	Young Sailor	37
1	Mayflower	45
1	Jacob's Narrative	1 25
1	McCulloch, mus.	6 00
1	Neal's Puritans, mus., (Captain)	3 50
1	Mysteries of Paris	75
1	Chuzzlewit	75
1	Hoboken	45
1	Priedeaux's Connexion, (Captain)	3 75
1	set Family Library, (except 14 vols.,) 157 vols	69 95
4	vols. Boys' and Girls' Library, at 35 cents	1 40
1	vol. 10 Sparks' Biography	75
1	Joe Cowell	20
1	Plutarch's Lives	2 00
1	Seaward's Narrative	38
1	Robinson Crusoe	1 25
1	Shakspeare, 2 vols., sp.	2 75
1	England and the English	85
1	Percy Anecdotes	2 00
1	Downing's Letters	62
16	Nos. Select Novels, at 20 cents	3 20
21	Nos. Select Novels, at 10 cents	2 10
1	Webster's Dictionary	3 50
	Box	80

278	volumes	$179 36
2	Nos. of Illustrated London News	2 00
	Transportation from New York	3 50
		184 86

All the above books, 278 volumes, were placed in the library for general use.

W. A. BARTLETT.

Received, New York, July 8, 1852, from Lieutenant Washington A. Bartlett his draft on Mr. George Daniels, at ninety days, for one hundred and eighty dollars, which, when paid, will be in full for bill of November 7, 1844.

$180

HARPER & BROTHERS,
per WM. H. DEMAREST.

—

All these books received and placed on the shelves of the Irving library, with the full and free consent of Captain Montgomery.

WASH'N A. BARTLETT.

F.

CAPITOL, WASHINGTON, *March* 11, 1856.

SIR: In the hurry of copying the draft of my communication to the committee this morning, the *enclosed leaf* appears to have been omitted, or to have dropped out of the copy I read and placed on file.

Do me the favor to put it in, if on examination it should be found in fact to have been omitted, as I think it was.

It comes in between the words "carried me," and "officers are now found."

Please permit your clerk to show me the original that I may see that it is corrected.

Very truly, yours,

WASH. A. BARTLETT.

Hon. S. R. MALLORY,
Chairman Naval Committee, Senate.

SIR: On Thursday last I was informed through a verbal message from the clerk of your committee, that my memorial to the Senate complaining of the action of the late Naval Board would be taken up for consideration at the meeting of the committee on the Saturday following.

That memorial not only denied the justice of the *conclusion* to which the Board had arrived, but also the propriety and *legality* of the *means* which produced it. These proceedings were contested upon the ground that they had exercised the high functions of power without any of those safeguards by which the Constitution and laws seek to protect and preserve the rights of the citizen. In other words, that individuals had been tried, found guilty, and punished, who have had no opportunity of knowing the grounds of the accusation, to confront their accusers, to cross-interrogate the witnesses for the prosecution, and to have compulsory process for their own witnesses, and such aid from counsel as might be desired.

As for myself, I was on service on the coast of Africa, when I received intelligence of the striking of my name from the rolls of the navy, and I understand, from an inspection of the law under which it was accomplished, that the only legitimate question to have been entertained was as to my efficiency to perform promptly all my duties ashore and afloat, or in the exact terms of the law of the 28th February, 1855, "of performing promptly and efficiently all their (my) duties both ashore and afloat."

And feeling that injustice had been done me by the decision in my case under the law, I had, by memorial, appealed to the Senate for redress, and that memorial being referred to your committee I had supposed that your investigation would be limited to the *same legal issue* as was by the law submitted to the Board; and on that issue I am prepared to exhibit the most satisfactory evidence.

But in my attendance on the committee on Saturday, the evidence permitted seemed to take a far wider range, and which, in my imperfect judgment, was altogether irrelevant and illegal in this issue; and it still promises to take a range over the most of the globe, over all sorts of subjects, and to be confined to no limit.

What its future course may be, or the extent to which it may be permitted by your committee, it is impossible for me to foresee; and in this state of ignorance as to the allegations intended to be sustained against me here, I feel that any further personal attendance before your committee would be useless to me. I should not know how to defend myself, unskilled as I am in such proceedings, against imputations and evidences against which, from ignorance of what is to be attempted, I am entirely unprepared; besides, the committee have not thought it advisable to permit me to have the benefit of counsel, and therefore my presence even might be *injurious* to me, by my giving a seeming sanction to at least some testimony already presented entirely unworthy of your consideration.

I beg leave therefore respectfully to say, that I shall not give any further personal attendance on the investigations you may please to make, prefering to leave it to the justice of the committee to conduct the investigation according to their high sense of justice and the legal bearing of the act under which all these proceedings have arisen.

I have to request, however, that when your examinations or investigations are concluded, that I may be notified of the fact, and have authority, by the aid of such process as the laws can afford me, to bring before you witnesses, who, as I believe, will accord the fullest evidence of my efficiency as an officer, and my claims to character as a gentleman.

Upon my arrival at the committee room on Saturday last, I found several witnesses (some of whom had been brought from a distance) for the apparent purpose of testifying *against* me; and that my conduct and standing as an officer and man, as well subsequent to as prior to the action of the Naval Board, were to be subjected to investigation, without any specifications of time, place, or circumstance.

It was in this unexpected position, without distinctly knowing what were my rights or duties, I asked for permission to have the aid of counsel. This was denied me, on the ground that I was not upon trial, that the committee had *no authority* to summon witnesses on my

behalf, and that I had only been invited as it were through courtesy. Subsequent developments showed that my desire to have the aid of counsel was well founded.

It is proper to add that the committee proffered to *invite* such witnesses as I should desire to have examined.

The examination of the witnesses present was then entered into, and their object seemed to be to discredit me as a man and as an officer. My object is not now to enter upon a refutation of the allegations made. Much that was emphasized can be explained by a few words; and I have only now to say, that having made complaint of the Naval Board for their mode of proceeding, I cannot be expected to approbate or acquiesce in any proceedings in which my legal rights are not duly guarded.

It was not the *tribunal*, but its mode of proceeding, that I have objected to, in my complaint of the action of the Naval Board. I am informed now that I am not to be "*tried;*" and the committee, I presume, are investigating the propriety of the finding of the Naval Board, as to my efficiency to perform, promptly and efficiently, all my duties, ashore and afloat.

I appreciate the offer of the committee to *invite* any witnesses I might name; but it must be evident that this is not sufficient, in view of the range to which this investigation is proceeding—over different sections of the globe, wherever the fortunes of the service have carried me—and that before I can know even what documents to bring in, I should first be furnished with the charges to be sustained or answered to, and armed with *compulsory process to compel the attendance of witnesses.*

I do not presume even to desire to indicate to the committee what course it should pursue in the investigation now begun; all that I desire to say is, that if your committee think proper to examine witnesses, (and I perceive the chairman administers an oath to them,) I cannot, with any justice to myself, by my presence lend a seeming acquiescence to it.

If, however, when the committee shall have concluded the examination, it will furnish me with any statements that affect me as an officer, which in their judgment tend to sustain in any degree the propriety of the action of the Naval Board, I pledge myself to make a full, frank, and satisfactory explanation of it—and that the truth of that explanation, if it does not by its own nature carry conviction to every reasonable mind, shall be made good by those evidences which the law has heretofore recognized as full legal proof.

I have been in the service of the country for twenty-three years, during all which time I have never been the subject of court martial or reprimand. I may be pardoned the remark that "I have done the state some service," while in the discharge of duty legally and properly assigned me by competent authority, and to which I have ever responded with the most ardent zeal—as all my chiefs and the department can testify. But those who have been instrumental in producing the result, and placing me in the position I now occupy, are very naturally solicitous in bringing up witnesses to sustain the judgment made on their allegations; and the facilities afforded by official position are

confessedly great—especially where the citizen is not armed with process of law to bring in his witnesses.

Officers are now found to speak to matters which are to be used (if used at all) to justify my exclusion from that service to which I have devoted all the best years of my life; yet these matters have no reference whatever to the question of "efficiency." But what sense of duty has heretofore prevented these officers from putting their charges or allegations in such specific form as to have enabled the government to discharge its obligations to the service (if the service demanded it) and to myself? Let this *trial* come when and where it may, I am not only strong in the consciousness of my innocence, but in the ability to prove it.

In all that I have now presented, I beg leave to say that while I desire to preserve to myself all my legal rights, I have the most profound respect for your honorable committee, individually and collectively. They have a difficult and arduous task to perform, and will doubtless proceed in it according to the dictates of justice and a sound and enlightened judgment.

With high respect, I have the honor to be your obedient servant,

WASHINGTON ALLON BARTLETT.

Hon. S. R. MALLORY,
Chairman of the Naval Committee, Senate.

G.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, *June* 16, 1852.

SIR: Congress having authorized the construction of light-houses at different points on the Pacific, the department contemplates furnishing them with the improved French lenses, provided the needful appropriation can be obtained to cover the increased expense. But, previous to giving any positive orders for the purchase of them, it wishes to obtain particular and detailed information upon all points connected with the subject, and for that purpose has appointed you to proceed to Paris.

You will, on your arrival, make yourself acquainted with the different manufacturers of these lenses, and ascertain whether there is any choice between them as to the quality and excellence of their work, and their respective prices. The department wishes you to procure the latter in detail, not only as regards the different sizes or orders, but also for the separate portions of each, so far as they can be furnished by the manufacturers.

In the detailed statement of items and prices already in the possession of the department, it is presumed that there are many items enumerated that are either extra or unnecessary, and it is the wish of the department that, after a full consultation with the proper parties, you will determine upon all the accessories that will be necessary to make the entire lighting apparatus, including the lantern, complete and suitable for the intended purpose, without including anything

which, in your opinion, is not necessary. The information thus obtained distinct and separate for each size or order of lenses down to the 6th order, or lower, if any smaller order exists ; you will please forward as promptly as possible to the department, exhibiting the full and entire cost of each, on *ship-board at Havre*, with full remarks and explanations on your part, so that the department may be enabled to act advisedly in its further proceedings in the matter.

You will particularly ascertain and report on the subject of any recent improvements in the manufacture of these lenses by which their power has been increased, and obtain the best information as to the distance at which the different orders can be distinguished under ordinary circumstances when properly located, and at suitable elevations.

You will receive herewith the plans and specifications of the lighthouses, as they have been contracted for, on the Pacific ; and you are probably aware, from actual observation, of most of the locations, their elevation, and the nature of the neighboring coast. I will only add on this point, that the contract stipulates that in no case is the lighting apparatus to be less than one hundred feet above the water, and if any of the proposed sites are low ground the tower must be elevated accordingly.

In making your selection of the needful items for proposed construction of the lantern and lighting apparatus, &c., you will, of course, be governed by the nature, size, &c., of the towers on which they are to be placed, agreeably to the contract, and it will probably be most advisable to make these calculations on the basis that the towers may be finished before the lighting apparatus reaches the respective points.

If, however, there is a material difference with any portion of the apparatus, fixtures, &c., when they are to be placed on a tower already finished as the present ones are to be, or when furnished, to be put in their proper places during the construction of the tower, you will please note the same in detail in your report.

The department would also wish to have the statement of cost for any different kinds of materials which are, or can be, used in the construction of these apparatus, such as bronze, copper, iron, &c., which might be indiscriminately used, with your views as to which would be most advisable under all the circumstances.

Your report will also include the kind and cost of all the needful items necessary for the use of the light keeper as connected with the due care and operation of the light after it has been completed and put into use, including not only such items as will be permanently required for the above purpose, but likewise those which are in regular consumption, estimating the supply of the latter for a period of one year.

It has been suggested that the 6th order lenses will be advantageously employed in various small lights on the coasts and harbors of the United States, without making any other change, except substituting them for the present reflectors. You will please ascertain on what terms this order of lenses can be procured, with a suitable mechanical or other lamp, and without other fixtures or accessories of any kind ; or if you find on inquiry if the latter would be absolutely necessary in order to make the suggested change, then to include the

cost of them also, but to have nothing of the kind that is not *absolutely* necessary.

The department, after hearing from you as regards the smaller sized lens, and obtaining further information in connexion with the subject of *this size*, may probably try the experiment with six or eight of the smaller light-houses; and if it succeeds, extend to a much larger number.

With this you will receive a copy of a communication from the Light-house Board on the subject of the French lens. The department has not yet approved of this report, and it is not therefore furnished to you as a guide, but merely in case it may contain some details or information which might be useful to you.

The department will make no determination as to the kind or orders of the lighting apparatus and fixtures, as recommended in this report, until after it hears from you, and the needful appropriation shall have been made by Congress.

As an officer of the government, you, of course, are aware that the department is prohibited by law from making you any compensation for the service you may render in this business, and can only pay for your passage to and from Europe, and the customary travelling expenses to Paris, and your personal expenses while there, with the understanding, as agreed with you, that they are not to exceed three per cent. on the expenditures that you may make for the purchase of the different lighting apparatus.

You will please execute the customary bond required from all disbursing officers in the department of the sum of $———, with surety to the satisfaction of the department, and forward the same previous to your departure.

The department will hope to hear from you fully and promptly after you reach Paris.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

WM. L. HODGE,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

W. A. Bartlett, Esq., *U. S. N.*

H.

Treasury Department,
Office Light-house Board, October 26, 1854.

Sir: Your accounts for disbursements and expenses, under your appointment of the honorable Secretary of the Treasury, of November 16, 1852, for superintending, at Paris, the construction of light-house apparatus, having been referred to this office for a preliminary examination, and such a detailed report thereon as will enable the honorable Secretary of the Treasury and the accounting officers to decide understandingly on the various charges contained therein, I have to request that you will furnish, at your earliest convenience, the original, or a copy, of your appointment and instructions of November 16, 1852,

and such sub-vouchers, or other explanations of your expenses, as you may be able to furnish, to accompany the report from this office.

It is desirable that all the papers which you may wish to accompany your account from this office to the honorable Secretary of the Treasury be transmitted at the earliest practicable day, so that the subject may be taken up and reported upon.

I am, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

THORNTON A. JENKINS, *Secretary.*

Lieutenant W. A. BARTLETT,
United States navy, New York, N. Y.

I.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Office Light-house Board, November 7, 1854.

SIR: A letter was addressed to you at New York on the 26th ultimo, requesting that you would furnish, at your earliest convenience, certain papers, sub-vouchers, &c., to enable this board to report understandingly upon your accounts of disbursements, as required by the department.

No answer having been received, it is considered proper to inform you that this board will be ready, in a day or two, to take up your accounts, and that if you think proper to be in Washington to give any explanations that you may deem necessary to a proper understanding of them, you will please notify this office, that they may be retained.

Very respectfully,

THORNTON A. JENKINS, *Secretary.*

Lieutenant W. A. BARTLETT, *U. S. N.*,
No. 176 *Second avenue, New York.*

K.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Office Light-house Board, November 15, 1854.

SIR: I have the honor to return herewith, in obedience to your instructions of the 30th of September last, the accounts and vouchers of W. A. Bartlett, esq., for expenditures made by him for illuminating apparatus and lanterns for light-houses on the coasts of California and Oregon, under his instructions of June 16, 1852, and January 31, 1853, from the Treasury Department, arranged under the proper heads of appropriation; also, the vouchers presented by Mr. Bartlett for his passage from Washington city to Paris and back, and his claim of commissions upon his actual disbursements at the rate of 3 per cent., (the maximum rate agreed upon by the department, as will

appear from the following paragraph contained in the letter of appointment, dated June 16, 1852:)

* * * "As an officer of the government, you, of course, are aware that the department is prohibited from making you any compensation for the service you may render in this business, and can only pay for your passage to and from Europe, and the customary travelling expenses to Paris, and your personal expenses while there, with the understanding as agreed with you, that they are not to exceed three per cent. on the expenditures that you may make for the purchase of the different lighting apparatus."

* * * * * * * *

The two vouchers embraced in abstract No. 1, for the purchase of lanterns and illuminating apparatus for the light-houses at Fort Point and Alcatraz island, amounting to 47,998.33 francs, and the 13 vouchers embraced in abstract No. 2, for the purchase of illuminating apparatus and lanterns for Point Loma, Point Pinos, Cape Hancock, Cape Conception, Humboldt, and the Farrallones light-houses, and for stationery, drawing materials, and postages, amounting to 411,526.20, making a total of 459,524.53 francs, appear to be correct, and in conformity to the terms of the contracts entered into with the manufacturers of light-house apparatus in Paris, in obedience to the instructions of the department.

The vouchers Nos. 10, 11, 12, and 13, embraced in the last abstract and account are

For stationery - - - - -	243.25 francs.
For drawing materials - - - -	17.65
For postage - - - - -	122.85
	383.75

Equivalent to about $76 75.

The aggregate of disbursements made by Mr. Bartlett, including the four vouchers last named, amount to 459,524.53 francs, the commissions upon which, at the rate of three per cent., will be 13,785.73 francs; which latter sum Mr. Bartlett claims as a partial reimbursement of his actual personal expenses, in addition to the sum of $380 10 paid for his passage to and from Paris, and for which vouchers are furnished.

Should the maximum rate of commissions be allowed Mr. Bartlett upon the settlement of his accounts as an equivalent for his actual expenses, the whole amount of his expenses will be as follows:

For passage from Washington city to Paris, France, and back again - - - - - -	$380 10
For stationery, postage, &c. - - - -	76 75
For personal expenses, 13,785.73 francs, equivalent, at five francs per dollar, to - - - - -	2,757 14
Aggregate of expenses claimed - - -	3,213 99

The questions to be decided by the department under the instructions to Mr. Bartlett of June 16, 1852, are, it is respectfully submitted, the following, viz:

1st. Whether or not the allowance of three per cent. upon the amount of disbursements will be granted, amounting to about $2,757 14.

2d. In the event of the maximum rate of commissions (three per cent.) being allowed as above, whether or not the expenses of passage to and from Paris will be allowed as an additional charge, or will be considered as a part of the expenses embraced in the maximum rate, amounting to $380 10.

3d. As to the allowance or disallowance of the four vouchers for stationery, drawing materials, and postage, $76 75.

As none of the funds furnished by the department to Mr. Bartlett are upon requisitions from this office, the correctness of the credits as exhibited in the accounts current can only be ascertained by reference to the books of the register and accounting officers of the Treasury.

All of which is very respectfully submitted, by order of the Light-house Board.

THORNTON A. JENKINS, *Secretary.*

Hon. JAMES GUTHRIE, *Secretary of the Treasury.*

List of papers.

No. 1. Letter of Mr. Bartlett, and enclosures, dated September 28, 1844.

No. 2. Copy of letter from Treasury Department, dated June 16, 1852.

No. 3. Copy of letter from Treasury Department, dated January 31, 1853.

No. 4. Abstract and account current No. 1, with two vouchers and sub-vouchers.

No. 5. Abstract and account current No. 2, with thirteen vouchers and sub-vouchers.

No. 6. Abstract and account current No. 3, with two vouchers and sub-vouchers.

L.

WASHINGTON, *May* 18, 1856.

SIR: I learn by yours of the 16th instant, that on Monday you intend to examine the witnesses on the specifications contained in your letter of the 9th instant, a list of whom I furnished in my notes of the 10th and 12th. I presume you have subpœnaed or invited these witnesses. Whether they are all present I do not know. If not present, it will be for you to determine whether you have given such timely notification as has enabled those at a distance to be here, and whether in their *absence* you will consider it proper to make up

your report *without them*. These are questions which you must dispose of as to you may seem proper under the circumstances. The list furnished by me was confined, as you desired, to the names of witnesses to the *specific heads* suggested by you. The committee will, however, not forget that if the OPINIONS of certain witnesses examined by them, *and their belief as to what others believed* in reference to my standing as an officer and a man, are to constitute in the least degree an element of their conclusion upon this case, I shall confidently calculate upon their examining the witnesses, or so many of them as may satisfy the committee, contained in the two lists to be found in my printed letter at page 62, and thus designated:

"Witnesses as to my professional standing and character, under whom I have served."

"Officers of the navy generally."

I herewith enclose interrogatories as to the leading points of the subject under investigation, with the desire that each may be distinctly propounded, and the answer to each one written down in the precise language of the witness. I offer this as a suggestion merely.

I am, respectfully, your obedient servant,

WASH'N A. BARTLETT.

Hon. S. R. MALLORY,
Chairman Committee Naval Affairs, United States Senate.

P. S.—The intorrogatories for E. H. Harrison and James W Bingham. esquires, will be forwarded to the committee by the time of the arrival of those gentlemen, which I hope will be to-morrow.

W. A. B.

M.

Interrogatories for A. D. Bache, Esq., Superintendent Coast Survey.

1. What is your position under the government, and how long have you held it?

2. Do you know Washington A. Bartlett? If yea, how long have you known him, and in what capacity as an officer?

3. Was, or was not, Lieutenant Bartlett selected by Lieutenant W. P. McArthur (to whom you assigned the direction of the hydrography of the western coast in 1848) to take the surveying schooner Ewing to California with your consent and approval?

4. How did Lieutenant Bartlett conduct himself in the performance of that duty; to your satisfaction or otherwise?

5. Was, or was not, the success of the work of 1849–'50 on the western coast much facilitated by his zeal and devotion to his duties?

6. You being his (Bartlett's) chief, was any report ever made to you, in writing or verbally, of any bad conduct or dishonesty in the discharge of his duties?

7. Would you, or would you not, have continued Bartlett on the

work as its chief after the death of Lieutenant McArthur, if he, Bartlett, had desired to continue?

8. Did Lieutenant McArthur, or any other officer or person engaged on the coast survey, or out of it, ever make any report to you intending to impeach the character of Bartlett as an officer or gentleman?

9. Did you not, and do you not, consider Bartlett in all things an efficient sea officer, and capable of all the emergencies of any service to which he might be assigned?

10. Have you had any personal knowledge of Bartlett as a gentleman, independent of his official relations with you?

11. If yea, state what impression your more intimate acquaintance with him has produced upon your mind?

12. Has, or has not, so far as you know and are able to judge, the personal conduct of Mr. Bartlett been such as to commend him to your sympathies and esteem?

13. What is Bartlett's general character for probity?

14. It has been stated by a member of the Naval Board that "he (Bartlett) traded along the western coast, in some cases smuggling the goods on shore;" was any such report ever made to, or through, you to the department; was any such report current amongst the officers of the coast survey; did Lieutenant McArthur, on taking command, say or do anything which should have led you to believe that any improper act had been committed by Bartlett?

15. From your knowledge of the character of Lieutenant McArthur, do you suppose that he would have failed to report any such acts of delinquency as those alleged against Lieutenant Bartlett?

16. If you say you have known Mr. Bartlett for some years, state whether his character and conduct have merited your approbation?

N.

Questions which Mr. Bartlett would address to Commodore Jones.

Commodore Jones:

Interrogatory 1. Were you in command of the Pacific squadron in the year 1849; and were you at that time frequently at San Francisco? If not in command, what position did you occupy?

Interrogatory 2. Did you know of the schooner "Ewing" being commanded by W. A. Bartlett, and subsequently by Lieutenant McArthur, while on the Pacific coast?

Interrogatory 3. It was stated by a witness, before the committee, "*that it was known to one or more members of the Naval Board that his (Bartlett's) conduct on board the surveying schooner Ewing was discreditable to him, and believed to be dishonest.*" Be good enough to state whether, while in command of the squadron or otherwise, or at any other time prior to the action of the Naval Board, you ever heard of any conduct of Bartlett's, as connected with the "Ewing," either of a "discreditable" or "dishonest" character?

Interrogatory 4. Were you acquainted with Lieutenant McArthur and the other officers of the Ewing? Did you have frequent conversations with said officers during your and their stay on the Pacific coast? Did you ever hear of Bartlett's using the Ewing for the purpose of conveying goods and of smuggling them into San Francisco after their arrival there? Did either of the officers ever make such an allegation to your knowledge; and is it at all probable that such transactions could have taken place without your knowledge of them?

Interrogatory 5. After the arrival of Lieutenant McArthur, did he succeed Mr. Bartlett in command of the Ewing? Have you ever had any conversation with Lieutenant McArthur subsequent to that period? *Could Bartlett have used the Ewing for such a transaction without the knowledge of the officers of the vessel;* and would not such a transaction have been reported to McArthur on his taking command? Be good enough now to say if you had any conversation with McArthur *subsequent* to his taking the command of the Ewing in which Bartlett was spoken of; if yea, state what was the opinion of McArthur of Bartlett's standing as an officer and his character as a gentleman, as then expressed?

Interrogatory 6. If you knew McArthur, be pleased to state what was his standing, and whether it was such as to repel the idea that he would in anywise conceal or palliate conduct in a brother officer which was either "discreditable" or "dishonest?"

Interrogatory 7. Do you know Mr. Bartlett sufficiently well to speak of his character as an officer and as a man; if yea, state fully your opinion of it, and say in what estimate it was held by his brother officers?

Interrogatory 8. If you know anything to the benefit of Mr. Bartlett, showing his efficiency as an officer both ashore and afloat, state the same as though particularly interrogated?

O.

Interrogatories for A. C. Rhind, Esq.

1. Were you ever a lieutenant in the navy? If so, when; and what was your rank in 1848–'49?

2. Were you ever executive officer of the schooner Ewing, under command of Lieutenant Bartlett? If yea, did you not, as such executive officer, have charge of the general duty, storage and discipline of the vessel; and was it possible that clothing and merchandise could have been conveyed in that vessel and smuggled on shore without you having known it.

3. Look at the letters on pages 20 to 23 of the printed letter of Bartlett to the Naval Committee, and say whether they are correctly stated?

4. Do you know of any act of Bartlett's, while attached to or commanding the Ewing, which could warrant the assertion that his

"conduct was discreditable to him as an officer, and believed to have been dishonest?"

5. Did or did not Bartlett, while in command of the Ewing, discharge his duty with fidelity to the government and due consideration of all placed under his command; and was, or was not, the vessel commanded by him in a seaman-like manner?

6. Was, or was not, Bartlett also acting purser as well as commander of the vessel; and if yea, was he not charged with providing for the comfort of the crew?

7. Was there room in so small a vessel for any very considerable supply of clothing, after the vessel was stowed with provisions for so long a voyage?

8. Was the Ewing, her boats or crew, ever used by Bartlett for the purpose of trading or smuggling, or any other purpose than ship's duty?

9. Did or did not Bartlett often go from and return to the vessel in shore boats at a heavy expense to himself, rather than use the ship's boats?

10. Were you not attached to the Ewing as long as Bartlett held the command?

11. Please state anything you may wish regarding the official conduct of Mr. Bartlett as fully as if you had been particularly interrogated on that point.

P.

Interrogatories for Commander Cadwalader Ringgold, United States Navy.

1. What is your rank in the navy; was it the same in 1849, 1850? Were you at San Francisco in 1849, 1850? If yea, did you know of the fact that Lieutenant Washington A. Bartlett was there?

2. In what capacity did he arrive there?

3. Were you acquainted with the principal officers and citizens at San Francisco?

4. Were you acquainted with the estimation in which Lieutenant Bartlett was held by that community?

5. Did you know or hear of anything taking place there in connexion with Lieutenant Bartlett while commanding the Ewing, or subsequently, derogatory to his character as an officer and gentleman?

6. Is it not certain that you must have heard it spoken of, if any act of his had made his conduct odious, among either his brother officers or the citizens?

7. Did you, while at San Francisco, ever hear it charged by any one that Lieutenant Bartlett "had traded along the coast, in some cases smuggling the goods on shore," or any charge to that effect?

8. When an officer is the commander and acting purser of a vessel, is not the whole responsibility of providing in advance for the comfort

and efficient service of his crew in the hands of, and at the discretion, in a great degree, of the officer so commanding; and is it not the duty of an officer, when engaged on special service, to exercise his best judgment as to how he is to accomplish the end for which he is sent?

9. Have you known Lieutenant Bartlett for a series of years? If yea, what has been your appreciation of his general character for honor, integrity and truthfulness?

Q.

Interrogatories for Captain J. B. Montgomery.

1. Do you know Washington A. Bartlett? If yea, state how long you have known him; if he has ever served under you as an officer; state when, where, for how long a time, and in what capacity?

2. If you say in answer to the first interrogatory that Bartlett served under you as lieutenant, while you commanded the Portsmouth, from 1844 to 1848, be good enough to inform the committee whether any transactions occurred during that period, and more particularly while at Mazatlan and Monterey, connected with Bartlett's conduct as caterer of the mess, which produced on your mind any impression that he had been "culpably negligent," or "dishonest?"

3. Has Mr. Bartlett exhibited to you a printed letter to the Naval Committee? If yea, state whether your letters to him of February 13, 1856, and April 14, 1856, at pages 46 and 53, are not therein correctly set forth and do not express the opinions which you *now entertain?*

4. Look at the statement made at page 16 of said printed letter and say whether the said statement, as to your remark to Bartlett when you returned to him the papers and correspondence connected with the charges brought against him by Lieutenant Missroon and others, is not correctly stated?

5. What is your opinion of Mr. Bartlett as an officer? Do you regard him in every respect capable of "*performing promptly and efficiently all* (*his*) *duty, both ashore and afloat?*" State also your opinion of his character as a man?

6. Has anything transpired since the action of the Naval Board and the investigation before the Naval Committee which tends in the least degree to alter your opinion in this particular? If yea, state the same.

7. If you know of anything to the benefit of Mr. Bartlett which shows the charges brought against him to be untrue, state the same fully.

R.

Interrogatories to be propounded to James W. Bingham.

Interrogatory 1. Have you seen the printed reply of Washington A. Bartlett to the charges made against him before the Naval Committee of the Senate? If yea, look at what purports to be an affidavit made by you, at pages 23 and 24, and state whether the said affidavit was in fact made by you?

Interrogatory 2. Turn to Appendix IV, at page 58 of said reply, and state whether the receipt dated August 20, 1849, for the freight of said goods, is not correctly set forth?

Interrogatory 3. Do you know of Mr. Bartlett having ever introduced or imported into San Francisco any other goods than those referred to and paid for in said receipt? Were your connexions with him such as would have enabled you to know if any such transaction had ever taken place?

Interrogatory 4. Did you ever hear it charged or hinted at, in San Francisco, that Mr. Bartlett had in any manner evaded or attempted to evade the revenue laws of California?

Interrogatory 5. Did you know the general character of Mr. Bartlett for probity and integrity? If yea, state what it was and is.

S.

Interrogatory to be propounded to E. H. Harrison.

Have you seen the printed letter of Washington A. Bartlett in reply to the charges made before the Naval Committee of the Senate? If yea, look at the statement at page 24, dated Philadelphia, April 7, 1856, purporting to have been signed by you, and say whether the same was in fact made by you, and does not contain the truth of the transactions therein described, according to the best of your information and belief?

* * * * * * * *

Learning that Mr. Harrison, from indisposition, is unable to attend upon the committee, the committee assume, without submitting to him the foregoing interrogatories, that he would sustain it by his affidavit, and they regard it as if it were sworn to.

T.

Interrogatories for Capt. A. V. Frazer, U. S. R. Marine.

1. What are your relations to the government?
2. How long have you known Washington A. Bartlett?
3. Did you know him as the commander of the United States schooner Ewing? If so, where?

4. Were you in charge of the protection of the revenue in the bay of San Francisco in the years 1849, 1850?

5. Was there at any time any report made to you that Lieutenant Bartlett had defrauded the revenue, and were you ever called upon to investigate such a charge?

6. Look at page 22 of Mr. Bartlett's reply to the Naval Committee, and state whether the letter there printed is a copy of a letter addressed by you to him?

7. If any charge of such a character had ever been made, would it not naturally come to your knowledge?

8. Were not the inspectors of the customs placed on board of ships bound to return all permits to the custom-house when they had delivered goods under them, and would the inspectors allow goods to be landed with such permits?

9. What was the character and standing of Lieutenant Bartlett at San Francisco at the time you were there?

10. Have you had any conversation with any member of the Naval Board, before or since its session, touching the character of Bartlett while in California, and especially in reference to certain allegations about smuggling goods into San Francisco, which conversation you feel at liberty to disclose? If so, please state the conversation, and the name of the officer with whom such conversation was held.

11. Did you ever know or hear while in San Francisco of any charge against Lieutenant Bartlett which could warrant the assertion since made that his conduct had been discreditable and dishonest while in command of the "Ewing?"

12. Were you acquainted with the late Lieutenant Wm. P. McArthur; and if so, do you know in what estimation Bartlett was held by him?

13. If you know any matter or thing which would benefit Bartlett in this investigation, state the same as fully as if you had been specially interrogated thereto.

U.

Interrogatories for J. W. Revere, Esq.

1. Were you ever in the navy of the United States? If yea, when, for how many years, and when did you resign your commission?

2. Did you serve as a lieutenant on board the Portsmouth in the Pacific from 1844–'48, or on that cruise under the command of Captain J. B. Montgomery?

3. Did you know Lieutenant Bartlett as an officer of that ship, and were you a member of the mess with him?

4. Were you cognizant of the fact that there was some complaint or dissatisfaction expressed by the mess as to his administration of the mess affairs by certain parties? If so, how was such dissatisfaction settled or disposed of?

5. As a member of the mess, were you fully satisfied at the time that Lieutenant Bartlett entirely exonerated himself from censure?

6. Look at a letter on pages 60 and 61 of Lieutenant Bartlett's reply to the evidence before the Naval Committee, and state whether you addressed a letter to Lieutenant Bartlett, from which the extracts are published?

7. Was not the caterer who was elected to succeed Lieutenant Bartlett the proper person, according to the usages of the service, to receive the accounts and audit them?

8. Did Lieutenant Bartlett, to your knowledge, ever exhibit the least hesitation in surrendering the catership and his accounts for examination?

9. If a difference of statement should be made by a steward as to the amount of money handed to him, or as to the manner of its expenditure, do not the usages and courtesies of the service give to the officer the right to have his statement taken in preference to any person in such a capacity?

10. Would not a steward, or any servant who might be punished by a caterer for intoxication or other misdemeanor be likely, if he could find support, to array himself against the caterer?

11. Did you ever at any time withdraw your confidence from Lieutenant Bartlett as a man of integrity and propriety of conduct?

12. If you have anything further to say about the conduct of Lieutenant Bartlett as an officer and gentleman in all the relations of the service or society, say it without reserve, as if fully interrogated?

V.

Interrogatories for Henry B. Watson, Esq.

1. Have you at any time served in the United States marine corps, what was your rank, and when did you resign from the service?

2. Did you serve on board the Portsmouth with Mr. Bartlett?

3. Look at pages 14 and 15 of Mr. Bartlett's printed reply to the Naval Committee, and state if the letter therein printed over your name was written by you?

4. Did you, or did you not, succeed Lieutenant Bartlett as caterer of the ward-room mess, June 1845? If yea, did you audit the accounts?

5. Look at the original account filed with the committee, and state whether it is the same account you had in your possession. If you say that it is the original account, state when you returned it to Mr. Bartlett and why?

6. Had Lieutenant Bartlett been at any time arraigned under the charge as stated in the letter sent to him, October 8, 1846, by some of the mess, could you not, with the papers then in your possession, have disproved the allegations in the most conclusive manner?

7. Did you know at any time of any act of Bartlett's during that

cruise which warranted hostility to him, and did any act of his ever impair his usefulness as an efficient officer of the ship?

8. State any thing you know as to the general character and efficiency of Bartlett at sea, and his standing and character as a man.

W.

WASHINGTON CITY, *June* 24, 1856.

SIR: On the 16th day of May last I had the honor of receiving at my residence, Brooklyn, New York, a request, signed by your clerk, to appear before the Committee on Naval Affairs, United States Senate, to testify in the case of W. A. Bartlett, esq., late lieutenant United States navy, to which I replied immediately, both to yourself as well as to the clerk, setting forth the reasons why I could not comply with the request, but expressing my readiness to obey promptly and cheerfully any summons from the committee, which reasons it is unnecessary to reiterate here.

I am now on a visit to this city, the duration of which is limited by the department to one week, and learning from naval officers that my non-appearance at the time designated was attributed to a desire to avoid the examination, I have the honor to inform you that I am prepared to attend the committee at any time they may desire within the limited period allowed me, or at any other time when my presence may be commanded.

I am not aware how my testimony may affect Mr. Bartlett, but am ready to testify to all I know about him.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, sir, your obedient servant,

ALEX. V. FRASER,
At W. F. Bayley's, Stationer, Pennsylvania Avenue.

Hon. S. R. MALLORY,
United States Senate.

X.

SENATE NAVAL COMMITTEE ROOM, *June* 26, 1856.

SIR: I am instructed by the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of 24th instant, and to inform you that the committee, having finished its investigation of the case of Mr. W. A. Bartlett, late lieutenant United States navy, will not desire your attendance for the purpose of procuring your testimony therein.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

C. W. DOWNING,
Clerk Committee on Naval Affairs, United States Senate.

ALEX. V. FRASER, Esq.
At W. F. Bayley's, Stationer, Pennsylvania Avenue.